THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 2 JUNE Vol. XLV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Are the Churches Failing?

The publication by the *Daily Mail* (May 16, 17, 18, 19) of four articles under the heading 'Are the Churches Failing?' is most significant. In its introductory editorial the *Daily Mail* maintains that it is undeniable that in these momentous times the influence of the Churches continues to decline and asks 'Why should this be so?' The first reply to the *Daily Mail's* query is contributed by Sir Henry Self (President of the Modern Churchmen's Union) who has great qualifications for the task. In addition to his distinguished official posts in three continents he is also a triple University graduate in Arts, Science and Divinity.

Sir Henry Self maintains that the causes of the Church's failure do present enormous difficulties to the teacher of traditionalist Christianity.

What is needed is 'a spiritual religion which has refound itself even in the modern world.' Yet how the modern man is to secure it in the face of our modern situation is the problem.

> 'Anthropologists show him his animal roots and ancestry. Biologists see him as just another organism. Sociologists point to him as a bundle of 'conditioned reflexes' bound together only by social custom. Psychoanalysts explain him as a complex of psychoses and neuroses with no enduring "self". Philosophers analyse him away in terms of sense-experience. . . . Then along come the mathematicians, the physicists, and the chemists, claiming to explain life itself in terms of bio-mathematics, bio-physics and bio-chemistry. . . . So, when finally scientific criticism concentrates on the obviously legendary character of many Old Testament events and stories—most of which have their parallel in other religions—and passes on to question the historical accuracy of many

details of the New Testament records, the perplexity of the layman becomes grim indeed.'

Sir Henry Self asserts that

'many thinking laymen have left the Churches because their intellectual conscience will not let them remain inside.'

What the clergy need to do to bring back these deserters is to teach by example and precept that

'Christianity is the one religion which takes its stand on the dignity, value, and status of the human "person".'

Another task which Sir Henry demands of the clergy is to clear up as to where the Church of England rightly stands in the face of this situation. It is in its constitution and demands far more comprehensive and open-minded and progressive than many of its clergy and multitudes of the laity realize. Sir Henry points to the latest demonstration of this provided by the *Report of the Doctrinal Commission*. But he seems to us to go to the root of the matter when he writes:

'Always and everywhere man at his best "knows" the haunting Presence of the Divine, and Christianity is the supreme religion because it presents the life-giving experience of Christ, manifest in the historic Jesus, in terms which inspire response, despite the legendary accretions, accretions which should be frankly acknowleged. . . . If we believe that this world is controlled by a higher spiritual world focused on God, atomic energy is seen as a revelation, given through science, of new means for advancing the future of the race. . . . Let the Churches take their courage in both hands, shed obsolete formulae, adapt themselves to modern conditions, and proclaim with vigour the basic theme of Christianity that God is in the midst of the world struggling with its evil and redeeming it for the good. And that He calls to everyone to "make his own soul" by joining in the struggle.'

The Churches are Not Failing

In the *Daily Mail* of May 17, in criticism of Sir Henry's contribution, Dr. Wand, the Bishop of London, writes:

'No, Our Pews are Beginning to Fill *and we have no reason to abandon any of our beliefs* . . . people want us . . . not to drop articles from the creed but to put a few extra ones in. We have had evidence of this state of mind in the Church Assembly, where the laity have demanded a carefully articulated statement of the duties of church membership, and have now got it, all nicely printed under nine heads, on a piece of cardboard.'

The contents of the card are as follows:

A Short Guide to the Duties of Church Membership

All baptized and confirmed members of the Church must play their full part in its life and witness. That you may fulfil this duty, we call upon you:

To follow the example of Christ in home and daily life, and to bear personal witness to Him.

To be regular in private prayer day by day.

To read the Bible carefully.
To come to Church every Sunday.
To receive the Holy Communion faithfully and regularly.
To give personal service to Church, neighbours, and community.
To give money for the work of parish and diocese and for the work of the Church at home and overseas.
To uphold the standard of marriage entrusted by Christ to His Church.
To care that children are brought up to love and serve the Lord.

GEOFFREY CANTUAR :
CYRIL EBOR :

This is an excellent card to give to the newly confirmed. It is also a reminder to the converted, but it lacks converting power for the masses outside the Church.

Dr. Wand, dealing with miracles, remarks that if the scientist rejects New Testament miracles 'it will be on other grounds than that of innate impossibility.' This is true, not only of scientists, but of the modern-minded intelligentzia as a whole. Their attitude towards miracles is akin to our Lord's attitude : what value have miracles as tests in the sphere of moral and spiritual truth?

In dealing with the essentials of Christian Faith Dr. Wand writes :

> 'When people join us we want to make certain that they believe in God, Who created us in love; in His Son Jesus Christ, Who, when we proved false to that love, brought us back to it by His death; and in His Spirit, who gives us power to reflect that love in our own lives.'

To these essentials Dr. Wand adds belief in the need of Church membership and the hope of a blissful immortality. To any modern-minded people these aspects of the Christian faith are more attractively and more understandingly presented by the Modern Churchman's Creed in the words of an ancient Churchman.

A MODERN CHURCHMAN'S CREED

WE BELIEVE :
God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.
God is Light, and if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.
God is Love, and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.
Jesus is the Son of God, and God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.
We are children of God, and He hath given us of His Spirit.
If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.
The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.

Amen.

(Issued by the Modern Churchmen's Union)

When will our Bishops include this creed in their *Shorter Prayer Book?* It has already been included in *Songs of Praise* (No. 433) with musical setting by Martin Shaw.

The recitation of this creed does not demand belief in the occurrence of miracles in a three-storied universe in which hell is in the cellar, man on the ground floor and God upstairs.

The Papal Church Never Fails

In the *Daily Mail* of May 18 Monsignor Ronald Knox criticises Sir Henry Self and asserts 'Our converts don't shy at Dogma.' We reply: if they did shy at dogma they would not become Roman Catholic converts.

The real issue is are these Roman Catholic converts typical of the multitudes of 'indifferents' whom the Modern Churchmen's Union desires to convert? We answer that they are not typical.

Monsignor Knox rightly includes the M.C.U. in the class of those who are deeply interested in 'the things that never seem to change.' Here he and our English Modernists stand side by side. Where they differ concerns the *dogmas* propounded by the Roman Catholic church about 'the things which never seem to change.'

These papal dogmas seem with the passage of the ages to become increasingly incredible, e.g. the latest of all: The Assumption into Heaven of the body of the Virgin Mary.

What the M.C.U. strives for is the *revision* of church dogma in the light of modern research; Biblical, historical, scientific, etc. This revision entails abandonment of some traditional dogmas and the re-statement of others. St. Augustine succinctly defined miracles as *contra naturam notam*—something against nature as we know it. Hence an increasing knowledge of nature demands re-classification of miracles and so the re-interpretation or re-statement of church dogmas based on the miraculous. The infallible papacy does not recognize this need in the case of the New Testament miracles.

The M.C.U., however, demands much more than this courageous handling of church dogma if the multitudes of indifferents are to be won for Christian Fellowship.

Monsignor Knox criticizes the logic of Sir Henry Self's Christian faith that mankind's rational moral and spiritual evolution will 'in due course' win through in human history—the Coming of the Kingdom of God on earth as it is in heaven.

This may or may not be 'the traditional Christian world picture,' but we Modern Churchmen hold that it is the essential gospel of Jesus Christ.

Monsignor Knox presents the reason for his own faith as follows :

> ' We believe our Lord when He tells us that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against His Church. And belief in the Church is our reason for expecting the world to survive its present follies.'

The promise of Jesus (*Mt.* xvi, 18) that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church is not included in the parallel narrative of *Mark* viii, 27-30, and *Luke* ix, 18-21. The passage Monsignor Knox cites is an addition made in *Mt.* xvi, 18.

Since Gospel criticism demonstrates that St. Mark's Gospel was written before St. Matthew's Gospel and that St. Matthew's Gospel was not written by St. Matthew, we cannot feel the same assurance which Monsignor Knox feels that this promise to the Church (absent in both the Mark and Lucan parallels) was actually made by Jesus Christ.

It is not primarily on the Church but on Christ and His Gospel of the Kingdom of God and on the gift of His Spirit of Truth which shall guide us into all Truth if we are loyal to Him that we Modern Churchmen place our reliance on the ultimate triumph of the Religion of Christ. We recognize, however, that Monsignor Knox is compelled by the Roman Church, which decrees (contrary to sound criticism) that St. Matthew's Gospel is the earliest Gospel, to adopt the controversial position which he uses against Sir Henry Self.

Man Fails, Not the Gospel

In the *Daily Mail* of May 19 the Rev. Hugh Martin, ex-moderator of the Free Church Council, contributes a statement which is in harmony with the conviction of Sir Henry Self. He writes :

> ' Belief in the Christian Faith has been made unnecessarily difficult for the modern man. There are " legendary accretions " and " obsolete formulae " which ought to be cleared out of his path.
>
> There is a tragic amount of misunderstanding as to what Christianity is really about. A distinguished Churchman who led an investigation into the attitude of the men in the Army during the first world war declared : " If I thought Christianity meant what these men think it means I wouldn't be a Christian either ".'

While the ex-moderator of the Free Churches stands wholeheartedly for the Christian Faith affirmed in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, he does not hold that they are ' suitable for normal use in public worship.' He asserts that

> ' The great central issues of the love of God and the claim of Christ upon the allegiance of the human soul can be put simply, and it is not necessary to be an educated man to understand them.'

This simplification, however, does not mean that it is an easy thing to be a Christian. Browning was right when he wrote: 'How very hard it is to be a Christian.' Mr. Martin cites the case of Aldous Huxley:

> 'At one time a bitter opponent of Christian morality and Christian belief he makes a very significant admission in his *Ends and Means*. He tells us that his conviction that the world has no meaning was not only due to intellectual difficulties. "I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning: consequently, assuming that it had none, I was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption.". . . .
>
> 'The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics: he is also concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do or why his friends should not seize political power or govern in the way that they find most advantageous to themselves.'

The Christian, faced with the terrible potentalities of sin, can yet be an optimist because he believes

> 'in the divine remedy for sin in the offer through Christ of forgiveness and newness of life for men and nations.'

Many will be grateful to the *Daily Mail* for its Quadrilateral.

West Africa and the Public Schools

The debt due by our colonial empire and not least by our Crown Colonies to the English Public School system is great indeed, not only to the policies and methods of their administration, but perhaps even more to the personalities and characters of those who serve them on the spot. As we foresee their future environment we recall the prophetic lines of Gray's Meditation on the playing fields of Eton:

> 'Alas! regardless of their doom
> The little victims play.'

The Public Schools in which these splendid personalities are bred are British, but it may be news to some that two such Public Schools now exist in West Africa: Achimota in the Gold Coast and Igbobi in Nigeria. Their status is attested by the fact that 'the Headmasters of both schools are members of the Headmasters' Conference of Great Britain.'

Igbobi College, Lagos, in which we are now particularly interested

> 'was founded as a Union College in 1932 by the Church Missionary Society and the Methodist Mission to Nigeria. It exists, as its Constitution lays down, to "provide a Christian Education for African boys." It is controlled by a Board of Governors elected by the C.M.S. and M.M.S., and H.M. Government in the Colony. It is fully recognised and approved by the Education Department of Nigeria . . . At present it has accommodation for 180 boys, the great majority of whom are boarders. . . .

The Staff is all resident, and consists of two Europeans (the Principal and Bursar) and eleven Africans. Six of the Staff are graduates, Oxford, Cambridge, London, and Manchester being represented.

The boys are admitted at the age of 13–14, as a result of an annual entrance examination. These boys are usually the pick of the many Christian Mission Primary Schools, and some idea of their quality can be gauged from the fact that, annually, only 30 of the 600 who take this examination can be admitted. Normally, they stay five years, and at the end of it, take their School Certificate. Many of the boys ultimately qualify in the various professions, e.g. Medicine, Education, Law and Engineering. . . . Nearly one hundred Old Boys are now studying at Universities and Technical Colleges in the United Kingdon.

The training of the boys in matters of character and conduct is Christian, but is not narrowly sectarian. At the end of their school career, the majority are either confirmed in the Anglican Faith, or are received into Full Membership of the Methodist Church. . . . All the services, however, are those associated with the Anglican and Methodist Churches, and there is an S.C.M. Study Group in the School. . . . The Prefectorial system has been adopted, and many boys reveal thereby unsuspected gifts of leadership and loyalty. . . .'

The Principal of Igbobi College, Lagos, Nigeria, is the Rev. R. B. Parker, M.A., B.Sc., an old Ripon Hall student and formerly assistant master and assistant chaplain of Oundle (1939-1948). He has been Principal of Igbobi since 1948 and its present status is due in no small degree to his great educational qualities and leadership. Although Igbobi has its Houses, its Games, its Science Laboratories, it still has no Chapel and contributions which would contribute to this need deserve the support especially of Liberal Churchmen.

Mr. Reginald Parker concludes his latest Report thus :

'We are trying to do for Nigeria what the great schools of England have done for her. The danger to-day is that opportunities for higher education may saddle many lands with leadership directed by instructed pagans. We believe that the Christian Boarding Schools can do much to ward off this danger. And in Nigeria to-day, obsessed as it is with legitimate demands for more and more independence, the work of the Christian Missions and their schools is absolutely vital in its importance.'

'The Etcetera Oath'

Under the heading 'An Immoral Canon' the *Church of England Newspaper* of May 6 publishes the following statement :

A representative committee of the Church Society, Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, Modern Churchmen's Union, and the Truth and Faith Committee met last Friday for the second time to discuss the revision of Canon Law.

Grave concern was expressed in relation to the canon newly proposed which insists that anyone appointed to any office in the Church of England shall subscribe a declaration in the following terms : *'I A.B., do solemnly make the following declaration: I will obey and abide by*

the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical of the Church of England as they have been or shall hereafter be passed by the Convocation of the Province of the Church of England in which I may from time to time minister, and duly promulgated with the Royal Assent.'

The *Church of England Newspaper* further states that the Committee was unanimous in condemning this proposal and adds :

> 'It would be immoral for any person to sign such a declaration, and was dishonourable to expect that anyone should. . . .
>
> The declaration commits a signatory to obey any canon which Convocation may think fit to enact in the distant future, and there is no safeguarding clause for conscience, such as oaths of obedience and allegiance always include. . . . The whole principle of general acceptance which had for a long time applied to the thirty-nine articles was now abandoned. According to this, nobody who dissented from half a clause in these canons could accept ordination in the Church.
>
> No distinction was made between trivial clauses in the canons and clauses of the first importance. All were to be on the same level. The view was also expressed that this canon was so fantastic in its implications that it would be a mockery from the start and would turn the whole body of canons into a farce. . . . It was pointed out that those who would resent this canon the most were the best people and it was men of integrity who would be most deterred by it from seeking ordination. It was the antithesis of every principle of liberalism and freedom.'

Our hardly-won form of clerical subscription as determined by Parliament in 1861 after acceptance by the Convocations, with the right of final appeal to the judicial committee of the Privy Council in causes ecclesiastical, stands in no need of revision.

The newly proposed canon is painfully reminiscent of the *Etcetera oath* required by the abortive canons of 1640, 'an oath *enjoined for the preventing of all innovations in doctrine and government*' which includes the clause :

> 'Nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans and archdeacons, *etc.*, as it stands now established and as by right it ought to stand.'

The New Outlook

The *Daily Mail's* Quadrilateral on the problems of Church failure is supplemented (but without reference to the *Daily Mail*) in the Spring number of *The Modern Free Churchman*[1]— a fellow-traveller with the *Modern Churchman.* To this widely circulating magazine the Rev. T. Wigley of Blackheath, a leading figure in the Modern Free Church movement, contributes a significant pastoral letter under the heading 'The New Outlook.' He writes :

> 'The Archbishop of York in a long article in *The Times* on the day before his eightieth birthday looked back on the fifty-five years of his

[1] Published by the Union of Modern Free Churchmen, 135 Hemdean Road, Caversham, Reading. Price 1/-.

active ministry. The most important and striking change in the period, he said, was the decline in church-going and in the influence of the Church on the nation. He ended on a note of quiet hope after urging that now the Church had to face the task not, as formerly assumed, of dealing in England with Christians who had to be built up in the Christian life, but of making Christians not to minister to the faithful few, but to convert the masses.'

But Mr. Wigley asks what is the Church doing to meet this situation presented by the Archbishop's article? He comments:

'We were told that some changes were being made, practical measures towards unity, the reorganization of the parochial system, revision of the obsolete canons of 1603 for the guidance of the clergy, a greater share of the laity in Church affairs.'

Mr. Wigley doubts the adequacy of this programme to deal with the 'chronic inertia' and 'downright antagonism' with which the Church is faced. The ground of his doubt he expresses thus:

'It seems obvious that stimulants for the one, and sedatives for the other will not meet the need. Fundamentally we have to do with minds and spirits unbalanced. . . .'

'Ignorance, credulity, incredulity, and fear raised their protesting voices, revealing a state of mindlessness. . . . No wonder what is called the "psychosomatic concept," is receiving a new emphasis in medical science; not only our intellects, but our emotions, need educating if we are to correct the manifold weaknesses in adjustment and maturity of thought, from which a host of variegated symptoms physical and mental arises to make life miserable. We must be prepared either to do some strenuous and balanced thinking, or frankly abandon ourselves to comic strips for children and slush for all. If we choose the latter, what hope is there for any religious view of life? . . .'

'Our religion is our total reaction to our own here-and-now in our own experience; it is more than the echoing of what others said about some happening in ages long past and theological battles long ago. In religion we bet our lives on the momentous possibility that what we feel our highest moments are more than fitful gleams within the human tragedy, but that they belong enduringly to the universe itself and are a revelation of its essential nature. Believe and act on this, and life becomes not merely coherent and integrated, but radiant and rhythmical. . . .'

Sir Henry Self and Mr. Wigley are united both in their estimate of the existing religious situation and their remedy for it.

Matrimonial Nullity and its Dangers[2]

The Report on Matrimonial Nullity drawn up by the Archbishops' Commission appointed in 1949 to examine the laws of nullity, ecclesiastical and civil, and questions relating thereto, has just been published by the S.P.C.K. and has been very well received in all quarters as a competent, if not a convincing, document.

[2] *The Church and the Law of Nullity of Marriage.* (S.P.C.K., 6/- paper, 12/- boards.)

It consists of 74 pages in good readable type and the impression derived from its perusal by an amateur is that nullity is a vastly more complicated question than he had imagined and not least in the many ways in which our English post-reformation practice differs, both in sanity and simplicity, from that of Papalism. As an example of this we recall a case in which an Anglican bishop became the god-parent of a baby whom he baptized and later became her husband, yet without any scandal in civil or ecclesiastical circles in this country; although, had he been a Roman Catholic, he would by such action have subjected his marriage to triple nullification.

The Nullity Report appears to claim that the Church's doctrine of Marriage having been received by Divine Revelation is supreme over that of every other authority including that of the State. However, the verdicts of modern Biblical studies, combined with a tendency in modern Anglican clericalism to identify the latest decisions of Convocation with Divine Revelation, produce formidable difficulties to accepting this basic proposition of the Nullity Report, especially as it conceals a suspicious resemblance to the papal concession that a Catholic scholar may criticize every doctrinal formulation and liturgical practice of the Roman Church provided that he finally accepts as supreme the Papal Infallibility.

All educated Anglicans interested in our contemporary matrimonial controversies will find it well worth while to study this Nullity Report.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN ENGLISH SCHOOLS

By Rev. J. F. B. Chitty, M.A., Rector of Charlton-on-Otmoor

TWO problems troubled religious education at the beginning of the century. The first was to relate the New Knowledge, which was increasing at phenomenal rate, to the traditional religious outlook, so that it should be seen as a development and not as a dichotomy; the second was to teach religion without arousing sectarian controversy. Denominational differences were acutely felt in connection with the increasing provision of schools maintained at the public expense and this led to Religious Knowledge becoming the Cinderella of the syllabus. It also delayed general improvement in the nation's education.

The former problem remains in mid-century—as it ever will—and there is generally no lack of people to tackle it although they may find less support than they might expect from Authority. The second problem has now passed from the barren phase of sectarian controversy to that of experimental pioneer work on a nation-wide scale. The charm that has worked this miracle is the Agreed Syllabus without which the great Education Act of 1944 would have been stillborn. 'Something like a revolution has taken place in our attitude to religious education. Controversy has been replaced by peace and goodwill.'[1]

[2] The *Report of an Inquiry made by the Research Committee of the Institute of Christian Education into the working of the* 1944 *Education Act* has recently been published. It provides plenty of material upon which one can base a balanced judgment of the present state of affairs; there is food for thought, food for concern; and it deserves careful study. Not only does the status of individual members of the Research Committee carry weight but the Institute realised the necessity of enlisting the co-operation of the National Union of Teachers, the Joint Four Secondary Associations, University Institutes of Education and the Ministry of Education. Instead of making a nation-wide survey of the facts they adopted sampling techniques and combined the results of a number of different research projects conducted by different bodies some of whom were represented on the Committee. The aim of the Inquiry being 'to help teachers and administrators to make the most of the opportunity for developing religious education provided by the Education Act of 1944' it was more

[1] Prof. Lester Smith in the Foreword to the Report.
[2] *Religious Education in Schools.* (S.P.C.K.; 8/6. 1955.)

important to base their report upon 'ordered and dependable knowledge' than to gather actual information without comment. Indeed, the information already obtained is considerable and it is obvious that the Report could have been much bulkier than its 150 pages, but this would not have been an advantage. We are promised further publications of deductions from the information gleaned including an important treatment of the teaching of religion in Secondary Modern Schools.

The Report proper is divided into nine sections as follows: Organization of Teaching (13 pp.); Content of Teaching (33 pp.); Staffing (15 pp.); VIth Form Work (10 pp.); Secondary Stage, 11—15 (10 pp.); Corporate Worship (20 pp.); Equipment (8 pp.); Retention of R.K. (5 pp.); Standing Advisory Council (20 pp.).

The Education Act of 1944 marks a turning point in the history of religious education. It is true that Mr. Butler and Mr. Chuter Ede had to solve the seventy-year-old 'religious difficulty' if they wished to reform the educational system of the country, 'disputes arising from the divisions between the Churches' having 'vexed and retarded the development of the educational system for two full generations' (paragraph 30). At the same time they were concerned to raise religious education to its rightful place in the school life and this was a remarkable achievement. The enemy of religious education in the past does not appear to have been the 'forces of secularism,' as we are so often told, but bitter quarrels between the Christian denominations. The move to make the board school secular at the end of the last century was unsuccessful, but it had been preceded by a stale-mate of religious controversy. Like all other subjects, religious instruction was given or not given at the discretion of the school authorities, but the Cowper-Temple clause provided that it must not be denominational. Although regular worship and religious instruction had been the practice in the vast majority of schools the Act of 1944 made both compulsory, with the necessary provision for freedom of conscience. Religion was given a place in the school which it had never had by law before, only by custom.

The pioneer work by the early Agreed Syllabus conferences, convened by the Local Education Authorities in West Riding and Cambridge, had paved the way for the Act by providing a possible content of religious education free from denominational bias.

> 'Some people,' writes S. J. Curtis,[3] quoted in the Report, 'have expressed doubts whether in the present divided state of Christendom a syllabus which has been approved by all denominations (except Roman

[3] *Education in Great Britain since* 1900, p. 133.

Catholics) can give any doctrinal teaching which is sufficiently definite to be of value. An examination of the best known Agreed Syllabuses reveals the astonishing fact that the body of doctrine about which there is dispute is comparatively small when compared with the bulk of Christian belief which is accepted by all denominations.'

Paragraph 35 of the Report states:

'From 1870 onwards there has been, on the part of legislators and administrators, a not unjustifiable fear of entanglement in sectarian controversies. This was one reason why Her Majesty's Inspectors were inhibited from taking cognizance of religious instruction in elementary schools. Teachers in State Schools, on the other hand, were uneasy lest they should be called upon to repeat theological shibboleths or be branded as heretical for teaching any doctrine to which one or other of the denominations might take exception. The positive purpose of the Cowper-Temple clause, which was to make possible the teaching of the essentials of Christian belief and practice while excluding sectarian interpretations and propaganda, was obscured. The clause was so misunderstood that colour was given to the charge of teaching an eviscerated, bloodless Christianity in the Provided schools . . . the Agreed Syllabuses from 1940 onwards reveal a great change of emphasis. Increasing attention is paid to worship and the aim of the teaching is declared to be that children should understand and accept the Christian faith and follow the Christian way of life.'

The most encouraging—indeed inspiring—section is that upon Corporate Worship. The simple, sound conception of the purpose of an act of worship as being to 'provide the conditions in which those who take part may experience the reality of God' may be more than familiar to many but it needed saying at the beginning of this section and it is very well said. 'In worship there is an awareness which is the deeper aspect of knowing' suggests the link without obscuring the distinction between work and worship. The simple daily service—which is, of course, not an innovation of the 1944 Act—appears to be greatly valued and central to the life of most schools. 'I regard the daily act of worship as being by far the most important daily event in the life of the school' is the type of comment frequently given by headmasters in answer to questionnaires about worship. Even those teachers who objected to religious instruction in the curriculum did not express antipathy to the act of worship. Withdrawal from the daily act of worship appears to be confined to the Roman Catholics and, to a lesser extent, the Jews. Examples are given of worship being adjusted at times to include these remaining dissenters; the New Testament reading being omitted when Jews are present and all Bible Reading omitted when Roman Catholics are present. This practice seems to rest upon a somewhat naïve assumption that the New Testament is more offensive to Jews than to Gentiles and that Roman Catholics are not allowed the benefit of the Bible in the vulgar tongue. However it is good to hear that there are few

withdrawals although there is one well-known school (not mentioned in the report) in which, for the first time in its long history, attempts have been made to withdraw from the common act of worship, attendance at which had traditionally been a condition of entry. Apart from this there appears to be a very genuine determination to hold daily worship and many examples are given of this being done despite considerable physical difficulties such as accommodation. Where it is impossible to hold a general assembly daily it is frequently the practice for family prayers to be said in individual classrooms. As is to be expected the Head usually reads prayers in most schools, but sometimes the duty is shared by other members of the staff and by pupils. It seems rare that there is not co-operation about the form of worship between the Head and others and we hear of the Lectionary being supplemented by readings from the Fathers, Moderns, both Christian and non-Christian, Plato, Milton, Burke and so on. Those who have had the benefit of extra-canonical readings at services in theological colleges or elsewhere will appreciate the valuable significance of this practice and its implication that 'God has not been silent since the book of Revelation.'

From time to time clergy are invited to take part in school worship, but this is usually done in a way which does not appear to give 'denominational bias.' The British Council of Churches, especially where it has a local manifestation, is the 'Church body' to which the schools naturally turn and at one school inter-denominational worship is held in a local church 'to bring home the reality of the unity which underlies denominational differences.' The Ministry of Education was informed of this and raised no objection so long as the usual safeguards to conscience were observed. Of course, children have to be taught the differences between the denominations rather than the unity which is obvious to any intelligent child, and the interest taken in the Ecumenical Movement by teachers of religion will perhaps lead to the assumption that denominational differences are past history. So, of course, they should be, and it is much to be desired that that is what they will shortly become; if they do not it will put a hard strain upon teachers to understand, let alone explain, the treasured preservation of Christian disunion.

The section on worship concludes (paragraph 154), 'We should be wilfully blind if we denied the existence here and there of indifference, carelessness, or even insincerity, but *we should be distorting the facts as they are known to us if we did not assert with confidence that the predominant desire is to worship God in spirit and in truth.*'

The largest section of the Report is about the Agreed Syllabuses. Starting with that produced by West Riding in 1923 and the widely used Cambridgeshire Syllabus of 1924, we are shown how other L.E.A.s have adopted or adapted older ones or produced new ones for their own use. Prominence is given to local requirements (Berkshire, for instance, being based upon the Surrey Syllabus with an appendix upon the history of Christianity in Berkshire) but the Syllabus Conferences set up by the various L.E.A.s have been very much aware of one another's products. This has led to a more rapid improvement than would have occurred if a uniform syllabus has been adopted throughout the country. Also the individual members of Syllabus Conferences (before the Act of 1944, invited unofficially by the L.E.A., after the Act appointed officially by Churches, Teachers' Organizations, etc.) appear to have enjoyed a happy and harmonious relationship as they worked together on the common task.

The Research Committee notice the following development in the Agreed Syllabuses. The Cambridgeshire started with a psychological approach, matching subject matter to requirements of age groups by being factual and episodic and avoiding deductions. Sunderland, 1944, also psychological in approach, emphasised the affective side of children's interests, but introduced ideas beyond a child's comprehension. Surrey 1947 and Lancashire 1948 arranged material in Biblical order instead of following a psychological scheme. London 1947 and Middlesex 1948 attempted to develop a system in terms of Biblical thought. The nature of religious education was described as

> 'in the first place to know exactly the nature of these events which are the basis of historical Christianity, then it consists in laying bare the significance of Biblical events for our whole interpretation of the meaning of human life, then to substantiate both facts and interpretation'

and so bring out the doctrinal significance. Finally the later syllabuses combined the psychological, Biblical and interpretative approaches, finding it necessary to improve their practical value in three ways: by curtailment of material, by following a concentric pattern, by providing alternative courses for different levels. It is interesting to learn that there is little variation between syllabuses in the treatment of Church History. They conclude:

> 'the Agreed Syllabuses have done far more than merely provide a ground plan for teachers. They have filled out the word "spiritual", which stands first in the statement of the purpose of education in Section 7 of the Act. They have given specific and concrete content to the very general phrase "religious instruction" in Section 25 (2). This direction and definition would have been unacceptable if the Churches, or the Ministry of Education, or the two together had imposed a syllabus on the schools. The democratic and decentralised procedure established by

> the fifth schedule to the Act has made all the difference. The process of reaching agreement has been spread over the whole country. As a result of this there has been little criticism of the syllabuses on the score of doctrinal content or denominational reference. Individual clergy are occasionally heard denouncing the Agreed Syllabus as a bloodless form of undenominationalism which cannot even by the exercise of charity be called Christian teaching. It usually transpires that they have never even opened an Agreed Syllabus, are unaware that ever since 1870 it has been legitimate to teach the Apostles' Creed in schools maintained from public funds, and have never in their own minds discriminated between distinctive denominational tenets which divide and are excluded by the Cowper-Temple clause, and Biblical doctrine which unites and is given in Agreed Syllabuses a primacy which it certainly was not before 1944.' (para. 63.)

We have heard arguments of this kind put forward by people who ought to know better and recall a mischievous pamphlet which clearly stated that every School Manager not appointed by ecclesiastical authority was a non-Christian and bound to appoint non-Christian teachers. In quite 'responsible' quarters we have heard the 1944 Act dubbed Communist and witnessed a 'Church School' policy which was based upon open hostility to the Act, seeking to defeat it by legal quibbles and questionable appropriations. It is unfortunate that the Established Church, which may claim some pride in the 1944 Act, adopted as its 'official policy' one designed to retain and even increase its temporal hold over buildings and personnel instead of supporting and assisting the great venture of an Act of Parliament unique in its Christian intention. Both Archbishops Lang and Temple had advised the use of Agreed Syllabuses in Church Schools, supplemented by distinctive Anglican teaching, but the propaganda to raise money for Church Schools tended to misrepresent the intention of the Act and to reduce the Anglican Church to the level of a sect. Many Church Schools were 'saved' by borrowing money from the future, but it is difficult to know what they have been saved from. Unendowed schools not controlled by the Local Education Authority are dependent upon voluntary subscriptions to a very large extent for the necessities of their working life, and retention of these schools, beside burdening a parish, may very well deprive the schools themselves of certain material advantages. Whether the 'distinctive Anglican teaching' in place of the more universally accepted Anglican teaching of the Agreed Syllabuses is worth the price that has been paid and is being paid is a matter for consideration. Certainly this is the Educational policy that has come to be identified with the Anglican Church and it is unfortunate that the Church of England has not been more closely associated with supporting—and indeed benefitting from

—the Education Act which we have described as unique in its intention. For this Act, whatever its defects and imperfections, has restored to our country the right to call itself a worshipping community of Christian people. The later syllabuses frankly state that the intention of religious education is to link the children with church life and there is no doubt that this Act has afforded a great opportunity for a sound religious recovery within a generation or two.

How far and how well the schools are taking advantage of this opportunity may be gathered from the Report. The denominational problem seems to have fallen right into the background, some 90 per cent. of schools not using the right of withdrawal at all. Exact statistics are not given of the reasons for withdrawal and it would be interesting to know how frequently it was the free decision of the parents concerned. Roman Catholics withdraw more commonly than any others, Jews often only from New Testament lessons.

> 'Others named as withdrawing were Christian Scientists, Christadelphians, Plymouth Brethren, and other fundamentalist groups, members of the Church of England and, very occasionally, Nonconformists (from instruction in Church of England Schools).''

Withdrawal of a child by agnostic parents is extremely rare and this, coupled with the generally co-operative attitude of teachers to religious education, should do much to 'lay the bogey' of the dominance of agnosticism and 'humanism' in schools. Many teachers decline to teach scripture on the grounds of competence rather than conviction, although there is apparently a feeling that scripture ought to be taught by almost any teacher as being part of his cultural equipment. In the grammar schools there is an inevitable tendency for religious knowledge to be in the hands of a specialist. In this context the word specialist means one who specialises and not one who has special qualifications. Half the grammar schools have specialists making Religious Knowledge their main work, but only a third of these have any kind of academic qualification. The Research Committee rightly see the line of development to be to increase the staff specialists at the secondary level and to provide adequate training for the general teacher at the primary level. The University Departments of Education appear to be less adequate than the Teachers' Training Colleges in this matter and there needs to be some assessment of the value of the multitudinous diplomas available to the semi-specialist. Despite the shortage of specialists with qualifications there are few advertisements for scripture specialists in the Educational Press; at present the scripture specialist is neither as free

in planning his work, nor as well qualified 'on paper,' as specialists in other subjects.

It still remains that religious knowledge is not offered as much as other subjects for the General Certificate of Education. For every boy who offers Scripture at the 'A' level, 69 offer physics and 56 offer history. At the 'O' level it is one Scripture to 3 history and 4 French; 59 per cent. of the girls pass but only 38 per cent. of the boys. At the Training Colleges something like one in ten take Religious Knowledge as an advanced course and of these there are three times as many women as men. VIth form work seems to present a number of problems as being beyond the scope of the syllabus with which it must be 'in accordance'; although obviously some very good work is being done in individual schools. A problem not limited to the VIth form is stated in paragraph 85: 'how can the teachers deal with the Birth-stories, the Resurrection, the Feeding of the Five-thousand, the background of Jesus' childhood,' etc., 'if they have neither a knowledge of the local colour of the Bible nor thought-out convictions of their own' or 'select what a teacher can with certainty say are true stories of real men and women' . . . 'or answer the penetrating questions of children who want to know the why and wherefore, if he has not read and thought for himself sufficiently?' A Training College lecturer (paragraph 96) who found 60 per cent. of his students antipathetic to Scripture and 20 per cent. indifferent stated that '"Most of them had very real problems that required sympathetic treatment" and many of them manifested a deep sense of frustration and of being fobbed off with inadequate replies. *The majority of those who felt they had received great benefit from religious instruction laid emphasis upon their work in the VIth form.* . . . "These people have a very real interest in religious matters and hunger for guidance and wise instruction." Nearly half of these students attributed *much of what they understood about religion to church, Sunday School and home, but . . . found a lack of relevance to their problems even in the teaching there.*'

The Institute of Christian Education is alive to the problem of the Secondary Modern School Syllabus which will affect the vast majority of the nation. The VIth form problem, though smaller in dimensions, calls for re-thinking some fundamental issues and a more energetic attack upon the first problem of religious education which we enunciated in our first paragraph. There seems to be very little awareness in the Report that the pursuit of truth and the cultivation of the mind and the development of the personality are profoundly religious activities in themselves. There is only a very fleeting reference to what are called 'the problems

of conduct most frequent in early adolescence' (paragraph 107) although few educationists are satisfied with current methods of dealing with them and traditional religious instruction has, more often than not, been the opposite of helpful. Then again although the Spens report said that the Bible cannot be treated as a part of English literature[4] there is an important sense in which every subject is a relevant part of religious education. It would seem essential to link Biblical studies and Church history with ancient and modern history—especially social history—and the relevance of the past to the present, both for good and for evil, should stimulate a desire to research. We may go further and suggest that religion is a matter of seeing the relevance of life in all its aspects rather than 'seeing the relevance of religion to life.' Much of what passes for religion is totally irrelevant, however much we have to preserve the bathwater for fear of losing the baby, and no 'secular' subject is without its religious significance. Bearing in mind not only the medieval monasteries, but also the later development of the Religious Foundations of learning at Oxford and Cambridge and elsewhere, we may well ask whether anything better constitutes a church than a worshipping community of devoted scholars—a church in the elementary sense of the word. Though now all the schools of the country are by Law based upon democratic consent, Religious Foundations, the writers of the Report find it necessary to halt themselves short of the obvious conclusion. 'The analogy' (of the worshipping community of the school) 'with the Church is of course not complete' . . . 'There is in it, however, a considerable measure of validity.' Certainly there is; there is also a problem of what is, somewhat clinically, called 'after-care,' which means linking the educated products of our Christian schools with parochial life. The opportunity for religious development in a school community may very well begin to produce adults with a more mature religious outlook than that for which the average parish provides. The worshipping community that could meet this need would be more than a round of ritual observances (be they never so nicely performed) supported by social occasions. There might be a quest for something like a *secular religious community* (if we may coin the phrase) in which religion was neither part-time, nor escapist, nor compensatory, nor the 'cultural and social thing,' nor concerned with personal salvation, but centred upon the interpersonal relationship 'mediated in and through a community in which love of God and neighbour

[4]All literature in English is a part of English literature; no great writing is 'merely a part of English literature'; it has intrinsic merit and that is why it ranks as literature.

inspired, directed and gave meaning to every aspect of life, every activity, in every common day' (paragraph 84).

Will the VIth form boy of the future seek a degree in a theological school which has more chairs of apologetic than research? No one would deny the immense value and present relevance of much of the antiquarian research that is undertaken by our theological departments, but there are other equally important spheres of theological research as well as 'the contemporary revelation of God' in poetry, philosophy and science that do not come within the purview of theological studies as much as they might. Comparing it with University courses in the Humanities and the Sciences will he not find the Theological course inadequate in scope and limited in range? Will he not rather look for a school of religious studies where theology is a growing science, which is not confined by a tacit pretence that the Councils of the Church have *not* erred, and which correlates and teaches, not only the great world religions, but the flowering of our own Christian tradition into the stupendous achievement of the last five centuries of the Enlightenment as part of the progressive revelation of God? Will he be content with a theology which represents only one thin stream of religious awareness?

These questions carry us beyond the scope of the Report, but a solution to the problems so clearly and carefully set forth in that report will demand a far-reaching solution to what we have called the First Problem of Religious Education in the Twentieth Century. As the first half-century solved the second problem let us hope that the second half will solve the first problem. In the words of the late Archbishop William Temple, it is our special task

> 'to take care that what is being presented is the most enlightened interpretation of our tradition in accordance with modern scholarship and living contemporary thought.' (para. 83.)

MODERNIST MOVEMENTS IN THE NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS

PART II (BUDDHISM, ISLAM, AND JUDAISM

By the Rev. E. C. Dewick, D.D., Hulsean Lecturer, 1949, author of *The Christian Attitude to Other Religions*, etc.

IN the First Part of this paper (published in the *Modern Churchman* for March 1955) we considered some of the movements in Hinduism which may be regarded as 'modernist,' in the sense that they have tried to re-state the principles of Hinduism in terms consistent with modern knowledge.

In this Second Part, we shall deal with similar movements in Buddhism, Islam and Judaism.

B. Modernist Movements in Buddhism.

Buddhism, which sprang out of Hinduism in the sixth century B.C., inherited from Hinduism the ideas of *Karma* and *Samsāra* (i.e. the idea of moral retribution through re-incarnation), of this world as a 'vale of tears,' and of salvation by means of the suppression of all passions and emotions, until complete serenity is reached in *nirvana*.[2]

But it differs from Hinduism in having a historical Founder, a man of powerful and attractive personality, with a distinctive message for all mankind. Gautama (or Sakyamuni) the Buddha was born a Hindu, and remained a Hindu to the end, in his fundamental ideas of life and salvation. But in place of the Hindu Way of Salvation by means of asceticism and self-mortification, he advocated a 'Middle Path,' between austerity and licence, and upheld a positive standard of Right Thought and Right Conduct. He also ignored many of the obligations of Hindu society, such as the barriers of caste and sex, the authority of the *Vedas* and the Brahmin priests, and the sacrifices and other rites prescribed by them. Instead, he taught a simple moral code, and founded a *Sangha* or Church, open to all mankind, and zealous for the conversion of others into its fold.

'Buddhism,' says a modern Buddhist, 'is neither a philosophy nor a religion.'[3] Not all Buddhists would agree to this;[4] but there

[2] Nirvana (or *Nibbana* in the Pali Scriptures), has been variously defined as 'emptiness,' 'bliss,' or 'serenity.'

[3] Narada Thera, *Buddhism in a Nutshell* (1937), pp. 5, 9.

[4] Prof. G. P. Malalasekera says: 'Buddhism is not merely a religion; it is a whole civilization.' (*This have I heard* (1944), p. 3.)

can be little doubt that Gautama himself refused to make any pronouncements on ultimate philosophical and theological issues. With regard to the existence of God, he was agnostic (not strictly atheistic), and with regard to the existence of a 'soul' in man, more definitely negative. He laid down no creed to be believed, no ritual to be performed, no prayer to be offered. 'One thing only,' he said, 'I teach; suffering, and the extinction of suffering.'[5] He did not claim to be a saviour, but only a guide, pointing to the Way of Salvation, and warning every man that salvation must be won by his own effort, unaided by any supernatural assistance.[6]

Such a system, without creed or rite, offers but little scope for attempts to 'modernise' it. The *Hināyāna* ('Narrow Way') School of Buddhism, which prevails to-day in Ceylon and Burma, claims to have preserved the teaching of the Founder in its original purity. This may be open to question; in any case, *popular* Buddhism in Hināyāna lands has moved far away from the stern rationalism of Gautama, and is now permeated with animistic and polytheistic ideas and cults, including especially the worship of Buddha himself as a god.[7] But I have not come across any movements in Hināyāna Buddhism which could fairly be described as 'modernist.'

In India, Buddhism, after becoming the national religion, and largely displacing Hinduism for some ten centuries, at length declined and fell, and to-day is practically extinct in India; and the people have reverted to the worship of their old Hindu gods and goddesses, sometimes finding a place among them for the Buddha, but only as one among many, and not as the centre of a religion bearing his name.

It is possible that one reason for this was that early Indian Buddhism failed to offer the people that element of the supernatural for which human nature always seems to crave.[8]

Be that as it may, it is clear that when Buddhist missionaries reached the lands of the Far East, they did begin to supply that supernatural element; and the result has been the wonderful growth of *Mahāyāna* ('Broad Way') Buddhism, which has become a living faith for millions in China, Japan, and other lands of the Orient.

[5] Malalasekara, op. cit., pp. 86 ff, 27.

[6] Ditto, p. 30.

[7] Most Buddhist temples in Ceylon and Burma contain dozens, or even hundreds, of images of the Buddha, most of them replicas of each other, which are worshipped by devotees with the same fervour as the idols in a Hindu shrine.

[8] See Suzuki, *Mahayana Buddhism* (1940), pp. xxvi. xxxiv.

Mahāyāna Buddhism is in many ways the complete antithesis of what Gautama himself taught. It puts aside the historic, human figure of the Indian Prince who renounced his crown and at length found salvation for himself; and in place of this, sets the figure of the Eternal, Divine Buddha, to be worshipped as a god. Sometimes, he is associated with other deities; sometimes, he is presented as the last of an infinite succession of Buddhas; sometimes, as the greatest of the *Buddisattvas*—the saviours of lost souls, who set before us an ideal for us all.[9] The stern warning of Gautama: 'Thou must save thyself; for there is no other saviour!' has been forgotten; and Mahāyāna worshippers pray fervently to Amida Buddha ('The Lord of Grace') and the goddess Kwannon or Kwangsu ('Our Lady of Pity'), for help divine in times of need. The whole atmosphere of Mahāyāna is that of a highly emotional religion, making use of art and ritual as channels of its message, but devoid of historical basis or scientific evidence in support of its dogmas.

It has proved itself a *live* religion, able to capture and hold the hearts of ordinary men and women. In so far as it has related an ancient faith to the needs of the human soul in our modern world, there may be some justification for the claim made by some of its adherents, that it offers a parallel to those forms of Christian Modernism which take but little account of the historic Jesus, and build their faith on the divine authority of the dogmas of the Church.[9] But one may wonder whether even a Loisy or a Bultmann would endorse the unrestrained exuberance with which the Mahāyāna Church has developed dogmas and cults solely on the basis of devout imagination, and often in direct contradiction to the teachings of its reputed Founder.

The Young Men's Buddhist Association (Y.M.B.A.) in both Hināyāna and Mahāyāna countries has 'adapted' itself to the minds of young men who have come under Western influence, by introducing hymns resembling those of the Christian Church; such as:

> 'How sweet the Name of Buddha sounds
> In a believer's ear!'

But this is a piece of 'tactical propaganda,' rather than a serious attempt to modernise Buddhist methods of worship.

In short, Buddhist Modernism, in the sense of an endeavour to re-think the *original* message of Buddhism in relation to modern ideas, has so far made but little progress.

[9] 'We are all future Buddisattvas' (Suzuki, *Mahayana Buddhism*, p. 52).

C. Modernist Movements in Islam.

About a thousand years after Gautama the Buddha, Muhammad, the Prophet of Arabia, founded another great World-Religion. Islam, unlike Hinduism or Buddhism, has a clear-cut standard of orthodoxy, against which modernist tendencies can be measured. Its ultimate standard lies, not in the character or general teaching of the Prophet himself, but in the actual words of the Holy Qur'ān, which Muslims believe to be the very words spoken by God in Arabic to Muhammad, then recited by the Prophet, and written down by his friends; the archetype being laid up in heaven. So far, there has hardly been a single Muslim, outside Turkey, who has dared openly to question this dogma of the Divine origin and consequent verbal infallibility of the Qur'ān;[10] and any tendencies to modernism in Islam must keep (at least formally) within these limits, if they are to escape condemnation for heresy.

The Qur'ān, unlike the Bible, is a literary unity, embodying the revelations made to Muhammad during a brief period of fourteen years (A.D. 609-623). Arabic scholars are unanimous in praising its literary beauty. To those who are dependent upon translations, its constant repetition of the same ejaculations, prayers, and imprecations against all who reject its message, tends to become somewhat wearisome; though even in these, the majestic dignity of some passages can be felt.

Most Islamic scholars seem to be agreed that the picture of Muhammad's character presented to us in the Qur'ān is on the whole reliable. It is that of a typical Arab—a man of strong convictions and simple habits, a good husband and father, loyal to his friends, kind to his slaves; but with a strain of cruelty, craftiness, and superstition, which tended to increase as he grew older.[11] His teaching, as embodied in the Qur'ān, marks a definite advance on the contemporary standards of his day in Arabia; but it is not without serious defects.

Islam lays down a few clear-cut rules of truth and practice. In the sphere of faith (*Imān*) all Muslims are required to believe in the Six Articles of the Muslim Creed; viz.: (1) God (Allah); (2) Angels; (3) 'The Books,' i.e., the *Taurāt* (Law) of the Jews,

[10] In Turkey, being a Secular State, Islam has become largely non-religious, and thought and speech are free. Even in India, one may hear in private a remark such as was made to the writer by a young Muslim professor in Dacca, some years ago: 'I would *die* for Islam, any day; but of course I don't care a damn for the Qur'ān!' Cf. Guillaume, *Islam* (1954), p. 153; or Gibb, *Modern Trends in Islam*, p. 50.

[11] See E. J. Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, 1923 edn.

the *Injīl* (Gospel) of the Christians, and the Holy Qur'ān, which 'fulfils' the others; (4) the Prophets, including Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus—and Muhammad, the last and greatest of them all; (5) the Resurrection and the Last Judgment; and (6) Predestination.[12]

In the sphere of religious practice, Muslims must observe the Religious Duties (*Dīn*), which include the daily prayers, the Fasts, Almsgiving, and the Pilgrimage to Mecca.[13]

Orthodox Islam also demands the acceptance of the innumerable dogmas and rules in Muslim Canon Law (the *Sharīat*), and in the Traditions (*hadīth*), which even in the ninth century A.D. were said to number 600,000![14] It is true that Islam does allow some liberty to the individual by the principle of *Ijtihād*, i.e. the right of private judgment in interpreting the Qur'ān and the Traditions;[15] but even with the help of this loophole, any Muslim who attempts to re-interpret his religion in modern terms soon finds himself on dangerous ground.

In spite of this, there have been repeated efforts by individual Muslims, almost from the beginning, to get release from the ever-growing burden of 'the Traditions of the Elders.'

As early as the second century of the Muslim Era, there was a group who appealed to reason, in controversy with the traditionalists, and were called Rationalists, or *Mu'tazilites* (dissenters).[16]

Then in the Middle Ages, we find the great philosopher Al Ghazzālī admitting: 'in my own youth, the bonds of mere authority ceased to hold me, and inherited beliefs lost their grip upon me';[17] and another notable teacher, Ibn Khaldun, laying down rules, which are really quite modern in spirit, for the right way to criticize Tradition.[18]

Again in the eight century A.D., the Wahābis (a body of Puritan 'Fundamentalists') raised their war-cry 'Back to the Qur'ān!' not only against Western Imperialism, but also against the orthodox 'Ulamās' (theologians) who insisted on the Qur'ān *plus* Tradition.[19]

In all these cases, the dominant motive was to restore Islam to its original purity, rather than to re-interpret it in contemporary terms.

[12] See L. Bevam Jones, *The People of the Mosque* (1932), Part III, chap. i.
[13] Ditto, chap. ii.
[14] Guillaume, op. cit., p. 91.
[15] Gibb, *Modern Trends in Islam*, pp. 12–16.
[16] Guillaume, op. cit., p. 106 f.
[17] W. M. Watt, *Al Ghazzali*, p. 21.
[18] Guillaume, p. 21.
[19] Gibb, op. cit., p. 74.

But in the nineteenth century A.D., Islam (like Hinduism) became aware of the challenge of Western thought and of Christian Missions to its current beliefs and practices. This led (again, as in Hinduism) to a vigorous effort to defend the Faith against its critics; and this in turn to a realization that defence was impossible without reform, because Islam as practised contained so much that was indefensible.

Prof. C. C. Adams has traced the development of one branch of this movement, in his *Islamic Modernism in Egypt* (1933). Two of the earliest Egyptian reformers were Kamāl-al-dīn Afghānī (1829-1847), and Muhammad Abduh (1849-1905). To us, their 'modernisms' may not seem very alarming; but they had to suffer for them. Both of them were exiled from Egypt; Afghānī twice, in 1870 and 1879; and Abduh in 1882. Abduh had taught that 'the present rules concerning divorce, polygamy, slavery, etc., do not belong to the essentials of Islam, but are subject to modification'; and he had encouraged Muslims to invest their money in banks, and receive interest thereon, in spite of the fact that the Qur'ān forbids the taking of usury.[20]

More recently, in 1926, Dr. Tārā Husain was threatened with expulsion from the teaching staff of El Azhar University, for daring to question whether the *Ka'ba* (the Black Stone) at Mecca really was erected by Abraham, and was constrained to defend himself by protesting that this was only his conclusion as a scholar, and that this did not affect his beliefs as a *Muslim*.[21]

It is evident that Islamic modernism in Egypt, even to-day, has to act and speak with great caution. The magazine *Al Minār* ('The Lighthouse'), founded in 1898 to be a 'beacon' of liberal thought and the New Learning, soon found it discreet to veer towards a more conservative policy, in order to escape suppression.[22]

We turn now from Egypt to India, and modernist movements in Indian Islam. There the first important figure that confronts us is that of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khān (1817-1898), who has been called 'the Rām Mohun Roy of Islam in India.'[23] Like Rām Mohun (and unlike the Egyptian modernists) he did not regard Western knowledge merely as an enemy to be fought with its own weapons, but as an ally that could be integrated with the essential principles of Islam. Like Rām Mohun, too, he admired the moral teachings of Jesus Christ, and maintained that if both Islam and

[20] C. C. Adams, *Islamic Modernism in Egypt*, pp. 175, 82.
[21] Adams, *op. cit.*, pp. 82, 175.
[22] Do., pp. 256 ff.
[23] Farquhar, *Modern Religious Movements*, pp. 96 f.

Christianity were purged of superstitious dogmas and practices, they would be found to be essentially the same.[24] And just as Rām Mohun professed to accept the authority of the *Vedas*, but interpreted them rationalistically, so Sir Sayyid, while accepting the Qur'ān as the final authority, eliminates from it the supernatural element, and claims that its 'revelations' are in complete accord with reason.[25] This often leads him to 'explain away' the natural meaning of the Qur'ān in an arbitrary way. But in the main, Sir Sayyid was a sincere and courageous reformer; and Aligarh University, which he founded, did for many years largely fulfil his ideal of 'an Indian Oxford or Cambridge,' where Muslim students should receive an education in which the best elements of Western knowledge and Islamic tradition were brought into synthesis.[26]

A more radical modernist was Prof. S. Khuda Bakhsh of Calcutta. In his *Essays, Indian & Islamic* (1912), he urges that Muslims should decide their attitude to social problems (such as polygamy or *purdah*) not merely by appealing to the Qur'ān, but by asking 'Are these things *good* or *bad*? Are they beneficial to society?' and that, 'without any interference on the part of their religion.'[27] This is drastic indeed; yet even here, the authority of the Qur'ān is not explicitly *denied*, but rather 'by-passed,' by the appeal to reason and conscience.

If Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khān is akin to the Brahmo Samāj, another Muslim modernist, Sayyid Amīr Ali, reminds us of the Arya Samāj. He was a member of the Shia sect, but his book, *The Spirit of Islam*,[28] is an enthusiastic apology for Islam in general. He is a pugnacious writer; violently attacking the orthodox *Ulamās*, who (he says) 'have made the exercise of reason a crime';[29] vehemently denouncing social abuses, such as polygamy and *purdah;* and vigorously rebutting all criticism of Islam by the adherents of other religions, and especially by Christian missionaries. He idealises the Qur'ān, and the Prophet Muhammad, selecting only those texts which support his case, and ignoring or evading all evidence to the contrary.

For example: Polygamy unquestionably had the sanction of the Prophet himself; for he, beginning with only one devoted wife, Khadīja, at the age of fifty-three had nine wives, besides a

[24] See his *Commentary on the Bible* (1862), pp. 10, 32, etc.
[25] W. C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India* (1946), p. 22.
[26] Farquhar, op. cit., p. 95.
[27] Smith, op. cit., p. 32; Farquhar, op. cit.
[28] 1891; 2nd edition, 1922.
[29] Op. cit., p. 184.

number of concubines,[30] and expressly allowed his followers wives up to a maximum of four.[31] But Amīr Ali disapproves of polygamy; how then does he justify the Prophet's conduct and teaching? He excuses the Prophet's own polygamy on the ground that he was anxious 'to provide helpless or widowed women with subsistence.'[32] He evades the permission given to Muslim to have up to four wives by pointing out that this is governed by a proviso: 'If ye fear that ye cannot act equitably (towards all four), then, one only; or your slaves.' Now (says Amīr Ali) since no man *can* act entirely equitably to four wives, 'the Koranic prescription amounts to a prohibition,'[33] and in fact forbids polygamy altogether!

This kind of 'special pleading' recurs in every section of *The Spirit of Islam*—in the chapters on War, Slavery, the Scientific Spirit in Islam, etc. In every case, it is contended that Islam offers us the perfect standard, as against the lower morals of all other religions, and in particular of Christianity. All this gives only too much justification for Prof. Gibb's severe comment on Muslim apologists of this type: 'They have debauched the integrity of their fellow-Muslims.'[34]

Passing over a number of lesser Muslim apologists who are more or less 'modernist'[35] we come to the Poet-Philosopher, Sir Muhammad Iqbāl (1876-1938). The very title of his chief philosophical work, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* (1934), clearly indicates a 'modernist' purpose. He studied in Europe (1905-8), and returned with strong convictions—on the one hand that Islam must be revived in order to survive, and on the other hand, that Western 'civilization' has little of value to offer.[36] At first, it seemed as if he was about to lead a progressive movement in both thought and action; but as time went on, he appeared to be content to sound a 'trumpet-call' to advance, without himself taking any action in response to it.[37]

His *Reconstruction* is not easy reading, but is certainly bold and suggestive. Its main theme is the need for Action and Desire, and the development of 'ego-hood' or individuality. God is the Supreme Ego, and among created beings, Man is the highest

[30] Bevan Jones, op. cit., p. 233; cf. Sura XXXIII, 49–52.
[31] Sura IV 3.
[32] Ali, op. cit., p. 238.
[33] Ali, op. cit., p. 229.
[34] Gibb. *Modern Trends in Islam*, p. 75.
[35] See W. C. Smith, op. cit., Part I, chaps. 2–5.
[36] In 1907, he issued his *Warning to the West:* 'You are preparing to commit suicide' (Iqbal Singh, *The Ardent Pilgrim*, p. 72).
[37] Smith, op. cit., Part I, chaps. 3 and 4.

ego.[38] The essence of religion is Action; we must all re-live for ourselves the experience on which traditional faith rests. Islam (says Iqbāl) has too long been paralysed by Fatalism; it must now shake itself free from this, and be 'up and doing.' All this is in startling contrast, not only to the Hindu ideal of 'passionlessness,' and even the Christian ideal of humility; but also to the traditional conception of Islam as 'submission' to the will of God.

Iqbāl claims that this philosophy of his rests on the authority of the Qur'ān; but in order to substantiate this claim, he 'reads into' the Qur'ān abstract philosophical ideas which are quite alien to the naive 'picture-thinking' of the Arabian Prophet. For instance, he takes a simple text from the Creation-story in the Qur'ān, which records that God 'in six days created heaven and earth, and then mounted His throne,' as an endorsement of his own abstruse conception of 'the serial and non-serial aspects of Duration'—'Pure Duration' being God Himself.[39] He maintains that 'Heaven' and 'Hell' in the Qur'ān denote 'states,' not 'places'; and that the Resurrection is not to be thought of as a physical process, but as a spiritual revival, which must be achieved by human effort.[40] All this is quite arbitrary, and takes no account of the historical background of the Qur'ān, or of its original meaning.

As a thinker, Iqbāl is bold and stimulating; but in practice, he remained conservative, if not reactionary. With regard to the position of women, he assures us that he is 'sorrowful at the oppression of women in Islam'; and yet he upheld the *purdah* system, and pictured the ideal woman as one who 'merges her will in the will of her husband.'[41] His eye was turned towards the past, rather than the future; and he has contributed but little towards a real re-interpretation of Islam in modern terms.

There are, however, a few really liberal-minded Muslims to-day, who desire to see Islam modernised by abandoning its claim to possess an exclusive and final revelation, and by taking its part in the movement for inter-religious fellowship. Among these are Dr. Zākir Husain, Principal of the 'Islamic Community University'[42] at Delhi; Maulāna Kalām Azād (formerly President of the Indian National Congress), who holds that 'the root of all religions is one';[43] and Principal Bukhārī of the Arabic College in Madras, who says: 'Religion is not the monopoly of one section

[38] *Religious Though in Islam* (1934 edition), pp. 59–73, 93–104.
[39] Ditto, p. 46; Sura XXV, 60.
[40] Ditto, pp. 115 f.
[41] W. C. Smith, op. cit., p. 140.
[42] The *Jamia Milliah Islamiah.*
[43] M. Desai, *Maulana Kalam Azad*, p. 102.

of mankind.'[44] But such men are few, and have so far had but little influence on Islam as a whole.

There is one Muslim community which has attracted attention in the West by its missionary activity—the Ahmadîyyas, who control the Mosque at Woking in Surrey. Their propagandist energy may appear to be modern; but in belief and practice they are rigidly conservative. Their one distinctive belief is that their founder, Mirza Ghulām Ahmed (1839-1908) was the Messiah foretold in both the Bible and the Qur'ān, and that all Muslims who refuse to accept him as such are heretics. The latter, retort by denouncing the Ahmadîyyas as heretics and schismatics.[45]

To sum up : while there are many Muslims to-day who realise the need for re-adjusting their faith to modern ideas, very little real progress has been made. Nor is this possible until some Muslim leaders have the courage to advocate the study of Islam along the lines of sound historical and scientific principles, unhampered by the dogmas of the infallibility of the Qur'ān and the moral perfection of Muhammad. Then and only then, the way will be open for a true appraisal of the greatness of the Qur'ān and of its Prophet.

D. Modernist Movements in Judaism

Judaism, though relatively small in numbers, holds a unique position among the religions of the world, by reason of its conviction, persistent now for some twenty-five centuries, that it holds a unique place in God's plan for mankind.

Until the nineteenth century, Judaism in Europe was fenced in, partly by Christian Anti-Semitism without, and partly by Rabbinic orthodoxy within. But as soon as the ghetto-doors were opened, the more thoughtful minds in Jewry became aware of the impact of Western ideas and culture. Some responded to this by abandoning their Jewish heritage; either positively, by accepting Christian Baptism, or negatively, by just abstaining from any Jewish ordinances. Others threw their energies into the Zionist Movement; but none of them, whether 'Assimilationist' or 'Nationalist,' showed much inclination to attempt the reform or re-interpretation of the Jewish Religion.[46]

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, Liberal Judaism in America did include a religious note; but this largely echoed that of undogmatic American Protestantism. The 'Pittsburgh

[44] *The Way Through* (1937), p. 177.

[45] In 1954, the writer had the opportunity of visiting the Indian headquarters of the Ahmadiyyas, at Qadian in the Punjab.

[46] See J. Parkes, in *The Modern Churchman,* September, 1953, p. 207.

Platform,' drawn up in 1882, views God as 'Idea' or 'Process,' rather than as a Person, and looks for the fulfilment of the Messianic Hope in a programme of world-wide social reform.[47] It is at least doubtful whether the essentials of Hebrew Religion are retained in such a complete metamorphosis.

In recent years, however, there have been signs of a growing interest among Jews in the religious values of Judaism; and this, both among the conservatives, who still regard the Old Testament as their highest authority, and also among the liberals, some of whom differ but little from Liberal Theists in other religions. All of these alike are determined to preserve the *distinctiveness* of Judaism, being convinced that it has a unique place in the Divine purpose for mankind. Most of them (except a small group of 'Fundamentalist' conservatives) are prepared to accept the main conclusions of recent Old Testament criticism, such as the composite structure of the Pentateuch, and the existence of a human (and therefore fallible) element in all its books.[48] They are agreed that Judaism regards *deed* (obedience to God's commandments) as more important than *creed* (assent to dogmas).[49] They wish to conform as far as practicable to the Old Testament ordinances—the Sabbath, the Festivals, the Laws of Diet, etc.; but they do not regard these as unalterable for all time.[50] While rejecting the Christian doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, their attitude towards him, and towards the New Testament, is much less hostile than that of their forefathers.[51]

We sometimes find that in modernist Judaism (as in modernist Hinduism and Islam) its apologists, in their zeal to prove its harmony with modern thought, adopt arguments that are somewhat 'forced,' and tend to rely upon a selection of the finest passages in the Old Testament, while ignoring the many harsher notes of intolerance and legalism.[52] But on the whole, Liberal Judaism shows a sincere desire to 'bring forth out of the treasures' of its ancient faith 'things new and old.'

Our study of non-Christian modernist movements seems to point to two main conclusions: First, that every living religion

[47] Ditto, p. 212.

[48] See, e.g., Montefiore, *Liberal Judaism* (1903); Morris Joseph, *Judaism as Creed and Life* (1910); Leo Baeck, *Essentials of Judaism* (1936).

[49] So Rabbi Mattuck, *Essentials of Liberal Judaism* (1947), p. vii: 'There is no creed in Judaism'; cf. Montefiore, *op. cit.*, pp. 7–11; or Morris Joseph, op. cit., p. 32.

[50] See Montefiore, op. cit., pp. 89–98; Baeck, op. cit., pp. 268–278.

[51] Montefiore, op. cit., pp. 168–178.

[52] This is true even of Leo Baeck's *Essentials of Judaism*—a book of great literary charm and genuine religious feeling.

must allow some scope for periodic re-interpretations of its message in contemporary forms; and secondly, that such re-interpretations, if they are to be honest, must retain the real essence of the religion, and not attempt to justify the surrender of this by specious arguments. Modernists, as well as conservatives, need to remember that abiding unity is possibly only 'in the Truth.'

MORAL RE-ARMAMENT'S INITIATIVE IN ASIA

By R. C. Mowat, Editor of Report on Moral Re-Armament, 1955

THE forces of evil are the bitter enemies of the Cross. Materialism of any kind, of right or left, makes men deny Christ in their hearts, whatever they say with their lips. Organized as a world force, it seeks to prevent the Gospel being preached, even to eradicate belief in God—or only permit a kind of belief on its own terms.

To-day these forces are sapping and mining in Britain and the Western world. In the East they are more openly at work. For years it has been impossible to spread the Christian message freely in Russia. More recently the ban has been applied in China. Other religions, notably Islam, are also persecuted. The spread of Communism in Asia is much more than a political or even a social phenomenon; it has deep ideological implications.

It is possible to speak of the strategy of the forces of evil. Is it equally possible to speak of the strategy of the forces of good? What signs are there that the second half of the twentieth century may reverse the trends of the first?

Much may depend on whether the ideological struggle can be won in Asia. The Gospel of St. John proclaims the attractive power of the Cross ('I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me'). It is this attractive power which any real manifestation of the Holy Spirit would be expected to demonstrate, whether this takes place in a nominally Christian land, or in lands which have never belonged to the Christian tradition. This is why so much interest attaches to the initiative of Moral Re-Armament in Asia and Africa at this crucial moment in the world ideological struggle.

Many of the leaders of Asian and African countries have attended M.R.A. assemblies at Caux in Switzerland or Mackinac in the United States. Many have made costly decisions, involving putting things right in both private and public life (for inevitably

they go together). 'When I met Moral Re-Armament,' said a Nigerian M.P., 'my first idea was to put things right with my family. I had to tell my wife things I had done about which she did not know, and apologize sincerely. I found I had to apologize to my brother and to other members of my family for the way I had been arrogant and domineering. As a Member of Parliament I thought I had a special right over them.' Dr. Azikiwe, now Prime Minister of Eastern Nigeria, went to Caux a few years ago instead of to Prague; in consequence he was able to bring the same spirit of apology and reconciliation into his political work. Leaders of the Opposition responded, and to-day there is a united force in the country, seeking to eradicate the corruption and bitterness which would make Nigeria a pray to subversive forces, and to base national policy on absolute moral standards.

Developments of this kind among statesmen and ordinary citizens in the vast areas of Asia and Africa explain the warm reception accorded to Dr. Fadhil Jamali, leader of the Iraqi delegation at the recent Bandung conference, when he called for a new approach to solving East-West tensions on a basis of moral re-armament. His speech, which drew the longest applause of any on the opening day, pointed to this new basis for the policies of the African and Asian governments, 'whereby men of all races and nations, with clean hearts, with no rancour or hatred, approach each other with humility, admit our own mistakes, and work for mutual harmony and peace.'

To implement this programme a unique act of statesmanship is being planned—a world mission which may prove a turning point in the history of our age. It was announced by Mr. Ole Bjorn Kraft, former Danish Foreign Minister, and Chairman of the Conservative Party, to an audience of 4,000 in Copenhagen on May 4, and its launching was carried a step further by a thronged meeting at the Festival Hall in London a fortnight later. Mr. Kraft outlined the scope of this world mission by quoting invitations from the Shah of Iran, from the Prime Minister of Japan, and from leaders of other Asian and Middle Eastern countries—'a world enterprise,' as the Iranian Foreign Minister, M. Entezam, describes it, 'to lift international relations into a new dimension.'

At the meeting in Copenhagen Mr. Kraft said :

> 'The time has come to make a supreme effort to create a new thinking and a new understanding on a world scale. With this in mind, the thought was born that a group of political leaders from Europe and other continents should undertake a world mission to Asia and the Middle East to focus the attention of heads of state and national leaders on the need to find an answer to the deep-rooted ideological crisis in the world.

> Europe has many things to put right with the Asian nations. We must admit that frankly. But freedom in the world to-day depends on East and West finding together a common programme, which will create the new order we all long to see. We are going to Asia to talk frankly with the leaders there and find with them a unity and common ideological foundation for the future.'

With the backing of such men as Dr. Adenauer and M. Robert Schuman, a group of political leaders drawn from Europe, West Africa and the Middle East are meeting at the end of May at Mackinac. Among them will be a German Cabinet Minister, and from Britain Mr. John McGovern, M.P. for Shettlestone. At Mackinac they will join with a larger force, some 160 strong, including the cast of the new musical M.R.A. play, *The Vanishing Island*, and will proceed from Washington in mid-June by special planes to Tokyo, and from there to the other capitals of Asia and the Middle East.

The expected response to this initiative is suggested in the telegram of invitation from Mr. Ichiro Hatoyama, the Prime Minister of Japan: 'Warmly welcome your bold conception of statesmen's mission to awaken conscience and cooperation of all free peoples. Appreciate growing M.R.A. influence in drawing closer bonds of friendship and understanding between East and West. Visit of yourself and friends eagerly awaited in Japan.' From H.I.M. the Shah of Iran the invitation reads.: 'Every good wish for your great world venture to re-establish moral principle in international relations and to unite the nations in a superior ideology. We trust you will succeed in enthroning Moral Re-Armament in the councils of both West and East, and desire Iran to play her full part in this historic world event.'

The way has been prepared by the showing of M.R.A. plays throughout Asia and the holding of assemblies (notably one in Bangkok a year ago). Recently the Japanese Prime Minister saw Peter Howard's play, *The Boss*, performed by a Japanese cast in his home. But there is scarcely any precedent for the imaginative conception of this mission, with its appeal to men of diverse backgrounds. A French industrialist, M. Jean Delaoutre, said at the Festival Hall that he had taken twelve months' leave of his business responsibilities to take part in this world mission. Mr. James Haworth, of the Labour Party Executive, interrupted his election campaign in Lancashire to be present at the meeting because, as he said, 'I have found in these last weeks a tremendous hunger for a new kind of statesmanship, something that will rise above petty criticism and calling each other names.' He said he was going to take his share of responsibility for the mission—'never in the history of the world has there been such an ideology with

such a power and such support from every quarter of the globe.'

The play which will accompany the mission has among the cast leading personalities formerly of the D'Oyly Carte Opera Company and of Hollywood—Reginald Owen, the British-born Hollywood actor is playing the leading rôle. Ole Olsen, of the famous team of Olsen and Johnson, described the play, after seeing it on the first night, as 'a constructive ideological bomb which will have a great impact on the world.'

The cost of such an enterprise is considerable, though probably less than that of an inter-continental bomber. One British housewife took a lead in sacrificial giving, which resulted, by the time of the launching of the mission at the Festival Hall, in a contribution of £17,000.

Among living Englishmen there are few who know Asia better than Bishop George West, for twenty years Bishop of Rangoon. He is joining the mission because it has, as he said, 'the potentiality to enable the second part of this century to reverse the tragedies of the first.' It is an application, in the field of ideological strategy, of what Dr. Buchman calls 'the electronics of the Spirit,' providing an initiative for the free world which can arrest the forces of atheism and destruction. Recalling men to God's guidance and to absolute moral standards is the surest road to building a free society that is worthy of the name, not only in Asia but throughout the world. 'With the electronics of the Spirit, renaissance becomes inevitable,' says Dr. Buchman, 'and it can happen fast.'

I AM IMMORTAL*

By Rev. John D. Pearce-Higgins, M.A. (Vicar of Putney)

'Seeing then, that we are compassed about with so great a cloud of Witnesses let us lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us and let us run with patience the race that is set before us looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith' (*Heb.* xii; 1–2).

I HAVE been invited to speak to you this evening as a member of the Churches Fellowship for Psychical Study, a fellowship which has grown in the course of a few months, out of the original group of clergy, and ministers, and one or two interested lay-people called together by the initiative of Col. Reginald Lester, into a body of some 1,200 members and associates. The object of the prime movers in this matter, is to interest the churches in the study of psychic phenomena, to which the churches are by no means alone in appearing to turn a blind eye, and to endeavour to elucidate and bring home to the adherents of the Christian faith, the significance and implications of this field of scientific study, upon which, of all people the clergy and laity of the churches which profess and call themselves Christian should be much better informed than they are. If therefore I speak to you tonight more from the psychic angle it is not because I am unaware of other possible lines of approach, but because this is what I have been briefed to do, and because I am perhaps a little less unqualified to deal with this aspect of the question than are many others who might discourse to you far more eloquently upon different facets of the great problem of immortality. The Dean, when he gave me the subject of my address tonight, gave the truly terrifying title 'I am Immortal.'

Let us try to remember that in all our studies in this world, we are both outside and inside the things and events which we are studying. To deal with such a question, therefore, we may well begin with the evidence of introspection, meditation, and mystical experience. I feel sure that to a mystic like the former Dean of this Cathedral the evidence of psychic phenomena was not needed —indeed we know for a fact that he intensely disliked and distrusted it, and expressed himself unwilling to participate in heaven if it should prove to be like what spiritualists have claimed it to be on the strength of the evidence, often rather conflicting (it must be admitted), which they claimed to have received about it. His faith was based on his own inner experience, on his own

* Sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral 3rd Sunday after Epiphany, 1955.

spiritual experiences which enabled him to say as did Emily Bronte:

> 'No coward soul is mine,
> No trembler in the world's storm-troubled sphere:
> I see heaven's glory shine,
> And faith shines equal, arming me from fear.'

But few men and women are capable of such deep introspection or such successful attainment of the goal of vision. None the less we must not forget that since we are alive, and ourselves a self-conscious part of life, there is no more profound advice than that so faithfully followed by Socrates, given by the Delphic oracle: *Know thyself.* It is recorded that Socrates was once asked by an Indian philosopher who was visiting Athens what was his method of study. 'I seek to understand myself,' was the reply of Socrates. To which the Indian made the memorable answer, 'The study of yourself will inevitably lead you to God.' Those who have succeeded in retiring into the inner chamber of the soul have truly found the Kingdom of God within them.

The habits of scientific method have, however, accustomed us to looking at man as though he were just another external object, and such a study in its extremest form has given rise to the purely mechanistic philosophy of 'Behaviourism' which simply looks upon the human being as a complicated nervous organisation reacting mechanically to external stimuli and sub-conscious demands. That is certainly a partially true picture, but so partial as in effect to be untrue. Man needs, in order to behold even his own body in totality, to observe it in a mirror . . . and it is extremely helpful also psychologically and spiritually to observe himself in the mirror of others. Therefore the reflection of his own activities which he can see in the observation of psychic phenomena is extremely valuable. Even if a man has never had any psychic experience himself, of telepathy, or precognition or clairvoyance (though a surprisingly large number of people have), even if he has never had anything very great in the way of mystical experience of those

> 'falling from us, vanishings, blank misgivings of a creature moving about in worlds not realised,'

as Wordsworth calls such experience—and indeed they are truly alarming—even if we have not had any such experiences ourselves, none the less the beholding of ourselves in the mirror of observed psychic phenomena, may well serve to awaken us to latent potentialities of our own spirits of which we had been previously unaware.

What are the implications of telepathy and precognition? They are, I believe, quite astounding. They have been set forth

by Prof. H. H. Price of Oxford in a series of articles in the *Hibbert Journal*. Telepathy, the communication of mind with mind, quite apart from the use of the organs of sense or of external material aids—a communication whose potency does not appear in any way to be diminished by distance, as is the case with the ordinary mechanical means of communication such as wireless or telephone, let alone the human eye or voice—would seem to indicate that the MIND of man is not in space at all, or at least if temporarily located in a spacial attachment, is not of itself of the nature of space or conditioned by it. Similarly the fact of precognition—so carefully demonstrated by Prof. Osty,[1] and also by Dr. Soal,[2] the ability to foresee certain events before they happen, often taking the form of the seeing in the mind's eye of scenes and events which are not yet *in situ*, and cannot therefore be possibly seen by the physical eye—would seem to indicate similarly that the mind, although located in time, is not itself a part of time or conditioned by the time process. What then indeed is this mind of man if it be neither of space nor time? Can it be said to be IN the human body at all?

I expect someone will be thinking, well that is ridiculous! we never become aware of minds walking about discarnate, we always find a mind attached to a body and indeed we know well that if you are ill, or your brain has received an injury, your thinking is distorted or ceases, and as for death, well, the brain stops working, and all thought ceases. But is that really so?

Just let us ask ourselves what is happening at this very moment.

Here in the pulpit is a human being who is trying to communicate with his fellow human beings. What is he doing? His spirit is thinking, as a result of which process, delicate and complicated processes[3] in the cells of the physical brain are setting in motion muscular activities in his thorax and larynx, which are causing the expulsion of waves of sound. These waves of sound are travelling I hope reasonably successfully (whether aided by mechanical means or not does not matter to our argument) across the space of this cathedral. They are striking upon your ear drums, after which, by an equally delicate and complicated mechanism of nerves, membranes, fluids, canals, etc., a series of nervous and electrically measurable impulses are being transmitted to the cortex of your brain. But are you receiving them as

[1] *Supernormal faculties in Man.* (Methuen.)

[2] A good summary will be found in R. C. Johnson, *Imprisoned Splendour*, chap. vi.

[3] For a detailed account see R. C. Johnson, *Imprisoned Splendour*, chap vi.

nervous impulses? I trust not! You are receiving them, in a simply miraculous way, as thoughts. Go into an anatomy museum and look at a series of brains in spirit—sitting there in jars like a lot of cauliflowers—and tell me if there is an idea amongst any of them! If the mechanists are right, and thought is a by-product of the brain, and is to be compared with the phosphorescent glow on the back of a decaying lobster (!) we might expect even a dead brain, to sense a few little wisps of decaying thought floating about—but we don't.

This modern fallacy of identifying man's thinking with the physical brain seems to me about as much sense as the custom of the ancient Egyptians in feeding hundredweights of bread and gallons of beer to the dead Pharoahs in their sarcophagi, and since that custom endured to millennia, this modern one may well prove as difficult to combat.

If I were to drop down dead in the pulpit, my voice would cease, my movements would stop. Poor chap, how sad, you would say—he's dead!

I know analogies are dangerous things, but supposing I were smitten down by a stroke, by a *hemiplegia*—a slight clot of blood affecting my speech centres and paralysing my right side—I should appear to be moribund. Speech and almost all movement would cease. But supposing that it was only a slight stroke, and that mercifully the clot dissolved, having left little permanent injury to the cells of the brain, then in a few days' time I could begin to speak again, first tentatively trying to express my thoughts and gaining greater fluency as full functional freedom returned.

Surely this sort of fact, and the queer faculties of the brain in telepathy and precognition which I have already mentioned, ought to indicate that it is not the brain which thinks, but that that marvellous instrument which has been likened to a telephone exchange in its complexity, is in fact nothing more nor less than a telephone exchange. When a man has a stroke, the connections of the exchange get temporarily pulled out or jumbled. When a man dies, the whole exchange gets blitzed, and ceases to function. But the operator having retired to safety before the bomb burst, is himself unscathed and though unable to communicate, is none the less alive.

If there is anything in mediumistic communications, and I believe that in certain circumstances there is, and if there is anything in all those hundreds upon hundreds of spontaneous communications, visions, hallucinations if you like to call them so, sometimes only visual sometimes audible, sometimes both, which

appear to come in the form of warnings, or messages, or appeals for help or premonitions from dead persons, then it looks to me as though in fact, discarnate spirits could influence the minds of the incarnate, in just the same way as they could potentially have done when alive with the body. Dr. Tynrell[4] has recently reminded us that Myers in his great book—*Phantasms of the Living*—proved conclusively how high a percentage of such hallucinations are in fact the means of telepathy between *living* individuals. When such phantasms appear of people now for a considerable time out of the body, it is, of course, possible to refuse to admit anything other than the fact that such a phantasm was simply a message sent by the dying person in the last few moments of life, which failed to reach the conscious mind of the recipient, because his consciousness was too much occupied with the practical problems of living, but remained stored up in the sub-conscious memory awaiting a favourable moment to emerge. You certainly can affirm that, but I think that it hardly meets the cases of such apparitions of the mother, some years deceased, who appeared before her children as they explored a disused passage in an old house and frightened them from proceeding the few steps further which would have plunged them down a disused well shaft to certain death, or the dead sea captain's voice heard by his sailor son, who had lost his bearings on a stormy night, to pull the helm over quickly, and which thus saved him from running onto the rocks which, a few seconds after he had pulled the helm over, as the result of repeated calls, were suddenly revealed in a brilliant flash of lightning.[5]

These and similar communications I believe do in fact show that the Spirit of man when in the flesh as we say, is not in fact inside the flesh, but using it as a means of communication, and the body itself is an arena of experience which is no doubt valuable and necessary for spiritual experience and growth.

But we are not truly in the body—we are attached to it, for the duration, and the spirit itself survives the dissolution of the body.

I think it was Socrates who said 'Tell my friends when they look upon my dead body and behold my corpse that I am not dead. In God's name I tell you, I am not dead, this body was only my cage from which I have now escaped.' Nor is it apparently only at death that the spirit can be known to escape from the body. When the body is itself at a low ebb, and its hold upon the spirit at its lowest, whether such attachment is reduced by the ancient religious practice of fasting, or the ravages of severe

[4] In his book *Apparitions*.

[5] Two Examples from Hanman's *Death and Its Mystery*, Vol. 3.

illness, or the use of hypnotic, or self hypnotic practices, there are many who have had the experience of leaving the body for a season and then returning to it. It is a not uncommon experience of mystics, e.g. of St. Paul,[6] ' I know a man (whether in the body or whether out of the body I know not, . . . caught up even to the third heaven . . . and who heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter).' It happens in a considerable number of recorded instances of disease, and this experience seems to me to be a foretaste of what must be meant by death, as surely it was envisaged by the writer of that familiar hymn ' Rock of Ages.'

> ' While I draw this fleeting breath,
> When my eyelids close in death,
> When I soar through tracts unknown . . .'

Here then seems to me to be the value of psychical study, such as that Fellowship for Psychical Study of which I am glad to be a member, is pursuing.

As we observe these faculties of the spirit of man at work in others perhaps more gifted or psychically endowed than ourselves, we are led to turn our eyes inwards to our own hitherto unsuspected potentialities, we are weaned from that materialism which is the *damnosa hereditas* of the Judaism in our Christianity, which identified the ego or the personality with the body, and we are led to consider ourselves in more Greek (Pythagorean and Platonic) terms not as, ensouled bodies, but rather as embodied souls. We prefer to speak not of the Resurrection of the body but of the Immortality of the soul, or the survival after death of the human spirit, certainly in its moral, and probably in its intellectual entirety. If the spirit of man then, as I have tried all too inadequately to show, is in fact not of time or space, but akin to the great eternal spirit of all things, and if, as all our psychic evidence appears to show, it cannot help but survive the dissolution of the body, then it does indeed behove us to take stock of ourselves, and of our characters, and see just how much of ourselves we think worthy of survival of how much of ourselves we would like to live with forever . . . and with the help of the spiritual grace of God, try and remove as many tares from the wheat as we can.

Space and time are the arena in which our moral and spiritual strivings are set for three score years and ten, and through material media we are given the task of developing the temper of our spirits, and the quality of our lives, and of pressing on to the goal of our high calling.

[6] II *Cor.* xii, 2 sqq.

ROWLAND WILLIAMS, 1817—1870

By Rev. D. L. Scott, M.A., Rector of Creeton, Lincs.

ALMOST exactly a hundred years ago, in the spring of 1855, a book appeared bearing what seemed, perhaps, the somewhat aggressive title of *Rational Godliness*. It was not, however, a rationalist treatise in any false or restricted sense of the word, written by a disciple of Tom Paine, but a volume of sermons written by a Welsh clergyman named Rowland Williams. The words 'Rational Godliness' may be said to sum up what he stood for; for although he possessed a more than generous share of Celtic fire, there glowed in it a vivid awareness of his duty to love God with mind as well as with heart and to teach others to do the same.

Williams was born in 1817 and went up from Eton in 1836 to King's College, Cambridge, a few weeks before the death of Charles Simeon. Thus he reached Cambridge at a time when the Evangelical Movement was waning, and it would not appear that the devolpment of his subsequent outlook is to be ascribed to its influence upon him. He himself would have maintained that his theology was that of Bishop Butler and the other standard English divines, but modified of necessity by the growing knowledge and changing ideas of the nineteenth century.

The important period of his life falls into two overlapping sections: from 1850 to 1862 when he was Vice-Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter, and from 1859 until his death in 1870 when he was Vicar of Broad Chalke, near Salisbury. At Lampeter he had found a sorry state of affairs which had led his predecessor, Harold Browne—afterwards Bishop of Winchester—virtually to give up in despair. 'Our pupils,' Williams lamented, 'know *no* language. Welsh they cannot write, English they cannot speak.' But he set himself resolutely to improve matters, insisting that all students should engage upon the three years' course which the College prescribed and pass an entrance examination as a needful preliminary. This meant a loss in favour of other colleges, such as St. Bees, where the standards remained less exacting; but in making his stand Williams could no doubt count upon the hearty support of the Visitor, the great, though enigmatic, Canon Thirlwall—reputed to be the most learned Bishop in Christendom. Nor was it long before his efforts were rewarded since in 1853 Lampeter became empowered to grant degrees.

Then came the publication of *Rational Godliness*, and doubts

as to Williams' orthodoxy began to be raised. The main propositions put forward in this book may be summarized as follows:

> (1) Revelation is a progressive unveiling of God as love and as Spirit; (2) there was a preparation for the Gospel among the Gentiles as well as among the Jews; (3) the Word of God is not to be identified too literally with the Bible as a whole, and the human element in Scripture, where matters of secular knowledge are concerned, must be frankly acknowledged; (4) the Old Testament Prophets do not refer directly to the coming of Christ, their immediate reference is to people and events in Jewish history; (5) questions of the date and authorship of the different books of the Bible are legitimate subjects for reverent enquiry; (6) the Gospel miracles are to be viewed as examples of divine beneficence rather than of mere power.

These propositions are, of course, commonplace to-day, but in the 1850s it was a very different story. What with the furore occasioned by the Gorham Judgement in 1850 and the dismissal of F. D. Maurice from his theological professorship in 1853 there was no lack of watchmen on the look out for heresy. The publication of the sermons provoked an immediate outcry which was evidently not unexpected, since one of them was preached from the text: 'After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers.' The Bishop of Llandaff at once requested Williams to cease to be his examining chaplain, while Thirlwall, whose support he had more reason to count upon, intimated that it would be better if he left Lampeter altogether. Presently a determined effort was made to persuade the Bishop of St. David's to institute formal procedings against his Vice-Principal.

Meanwhile, Williams had taken his D.D. degree, the only man ever to do so, he believed, while expecting to be prosecuted for heresy. He had also published another book, entitled *Christianity and Hinduism*, which gained him a prize of £500 offered for the best refutation of Hindu mysticism. Thus it seemed to his critics that he was defending the faith and betraying it at one and the same time!

Though Thirlwall refused to take any action against *Rational Godliness*—indeed he could hardly have done so, seeing that his own declared views on Scripture were much the same as Williams' own—he still refused to lend any support to their author and a long and acrimonious controversy sprang up between them. So the offer in 1858 of the college living of Broad Chalke was welcome enough however reluctant Williams might be to exchange the hills of his native Wales for the downland and turnip fields of Salisbury Plain. In fact he did not finally resign from Lampeter until 1862. But though Thirlwall might welcome his departure, the Bishop of Salisbury certainly did not welcome his

coming. For it so happened that the Bishop of Salisbury at that time was Walter Kerr Hamilton, one of the ablest and most determined leaders of the High Church party, and the first avowed disciple of the Oxford Movement to attain an English bishopric. It was not to be wondered at, therefore, that he took strong exception to so dangerous a 'neologian' being presented to a living in his diocese, almost upon his own doorstep. He interviewed Williams several times before he agreed to institute him. But at length the latter was able to record :

> 'Feb. 3rd, 1859. The Bishop was very civil, though he did not conceal that he had taken legal advice whether he could safely refuse the institution. No very great thanks, therefore, to him for doing what he was obliged to do, except that his manner of retreating was handsome and courteous.'

Hamilton would probably have been less courteous had he known what was to come, and in fact his retreat was a case of *reculer pour mieux sauter*. For in that same February an advertisement announced the early publication of a volume of essays with Rowland Williams among the contributors. This was the celebrated *Essays and Reviews*.

Its appearance in 1860 at first caused no stir at all, and in six months it ran through only two small editions. Indeed that might have been the end of it had it not been for the zeal of Bishop Wilberforce. But about a year after its first publication Williams wrote in his diary :

> '*Essays and Reviews* are now lighting a candle. Lord God of Latimer and Ridley, cause this light never more to be quenched in England. Samuel of Oxford has organized some tumult. All the augurs, headed by Lambeth, declared against the book in Saturday's *Times*. "Tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito." '

Soon there was a general state of panic and the whole country began to resound with denunciations of *The Seven against Christ*. To Samuel of Oxford it seemed that the final day of reckoning was presaged by them, for his prophetic eye discerned not a rekindling of Latimer's candle, but

> 'the first stealing over the sky of the lurid lights which shall be shed profusely around the great anti-Christ.'

Naturally sales of the book now rocketed. Edition followed edition, and by the spring of 1861 the essays were being translated into such diverse languages as French and Parsee. Williams' own contribution was entitled 'Bunsen's Biblical Researches'—a review of the Old Testament studies carried out by Baron Bunsen, the German scholar and diplomat, which provided Williams with a medium for putting forward again in a more out-

spoken and summary fashion the views he had expresseed in *Rational Godliness*.

> 'If,' he wrote, 'we are to retain the old Anglican foundations of research and fair statement, we must revise some of the decisions provisionally given upon imperfect evidence; or, if we shrink from doing so, we must abdicate our ancient claim to build upon the truth.'

It was in this challenging spirit that the whole book was compiled. Hence the outcry it provoked. At a time when to most people all seemed well with Zion the Essayists feared that the Church was beginning to lose its grip upon the nation, and they saw a real danger of its dying, like Dean Swift, from the head downwards. Nor can it be said that their fears were groundless when Wilberforce, for example, the most influential Bishop of the day, could declare in his charge of 1860 that men were robbed of the very foundations of their faith if they were persuaded to accept such stories as that of the serpent tempter and Balaam's ass as poetry or legend. Though crude and naïve in some respects, the Essayists were certainly more far seeing than most of their contemporaries; and it is not, perhaps, altogether fanciful to suppose that the declining influence of the Church in modern times might have been lessened if their foresight had been more widely shared a century ago by the leaders of the Church.

At that time, however, their condemnation was universally called for. Convocation was appealed to, and—characteristically—set up a committee to consider what should be done. But the prestige of the ' Church Parliament across the way,' as Archbishop Tait once called it, had not yet waxed great, and a future Archbishop of York, Thomson, then Bishop of Gloucester, acidly remarked :

> 'Some few clergy, and some few old ladies who are readers of the *Guardian*, will say that when the Houses of Convocation have condemned the *Essays and Reviews*, the matter will be settled for ever—that no heretical dog will ever dare to bark again after this utterance of the Church of England. But I am thoroughly satisfied that the Church of England itself does not regard the expression of the voice of the Houses of Convocation as the expression of the voice of authority.'

Of the seven Essayists, six of whom were clergymen, two were at last singled out for vengeance. These were Rowland Williams and the editor of the book, H. B. Wilson, vicar of Great Staughton, near Huntingdon. Williams was prosecuted by the Bishop of Salisbury, Wilson by a neighbouring incumbent. The case was heard in the Court of Arches where some twenty charges were preferred against each of them. The Dean of Arches, the eighty-year old Dr. Lushington, took immense pains in reaching a decision—he is said to have read through the entire volume

of *Essays and Reviews* twenty times before he did so. That in the end he dismissed the greater part of the charges brought against both defendants says much for his courage in view of the clamour, the hysteria almost, that had been aroused. Nevertheless he ruled that what Williams had written on justification was at variance with the Thirty Nine Articles.

> 'Why,' Williams had asked, 'may not justification by faith have meant (*sc.* to St. Paul) the peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes from a trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer? St. Paul would then be teaching moral responsibility as opposed to sacerdotalism; or that to obey is better than sacrifice. Faith would be opposed not to the good deeds which conscience requires, but to works of appeasement by ritual.'

Sentence of one year's suspension was pronounced against him in December 1862. Williams at once appealed against this to the Privy Council. So the struggle continued. At the close of the year he wrote :

> 'The sun rose at eight, and the day was fine, and the year ended, second of the war between the Sarumites and the Essayists.'

At last in February, 1864, the judgement of Dr. Lushington was reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, both in the case of Williams and also of H. B. Wilson, each defendant being allowed the costs of his appeal. As Wilson had been sentenced in the Arches Court for teaching universalism, it was said that Hell had been dismissed with costs and the Church of England clergyman deprived of his last hope of eternal damnation!

Thus the matter ended, but not quite; for in the face of this defeat Wilberforce sought to obtain a further condemnation of the Essays from Convocation. This was easy enough to do, though Thirlwall spoke scathingly against it, supported more temperately by Tait. Hence there followed a scene in the House of Lords when the Lord Chancellor was asked whether Convocation had not laid itself open to penalties by seeming to flout the ruling of the Privy Council. But the Lord Chancellor, knowing that Soapy Sam was the author of what had taken place, replied that the resolution passed by Convocation was :

> 'simply a series of well-lubricated terms, a sentence so oily and saponaceous that no one could grasp it. Like an eel it slips through your fingers and is simply nothing.'

The story of Williams' life from this point onwards is simply that of a country parson. He had delayed his resignation from Lampeter and taking up residence at Broad Chalke for as long as he could in the hope that his name would be cleared from the

charge of heresy before doing so. But the length of the proceedings prevented this and at last he had gone to Broad Chalke not knowing whether he might not soon be deprived of the living altogether, having preached his farewell sermon at Lampeter from the text: 'Princes have persecuted me without a cause.'

Life at Broad Chalke was no doubt typical of life in many good sized English villages at the time. It was long since a Vicar had resided there, and Dissent had flourished even to the extent of supporting a resident minister. There was no school save one kept by an old dame who instructed her pupils chiefly by means of the rods to which she helped herself freely from the vicarage orchard adjoining her cottage. The vicarage itself was in a tumble-down condition and had to be entirely rebuilt, Williams himself contributing largely to the cost of it. Of the two dependencies of Broad Chalke one was made into a separate parish, while a curate was installed in the other.

Day at the vicarge began with breakfast at eight, and dinner at three was the only other meal. Williams said he would have liked to hold a very short service at six in the morning for men on their way to work if the Bishop would have permitted this. It is unlikely that the idea of saying Morning and Evening Prayer alone commended itself to him; and in fact his own devotions consisted mainly in the composition and revision of a manual of 'Psalms and Litanies' (much of which is included in an anthology, still often to be met with, called *Great Souls at Prayer*) and in re-translating and annotating the Hebrew Prophets—a work which now became his chief literary employment.

Despite the almost purely academic nature of his previous work and the fact that the Bishop's frown was heavy upon him, Williams seems to have adapted himself to his new and restricted sphere with good sense and practical enthusiasm. He could not agree with the Methodists that his parish was 'blest'—as they put it—by having so many places of worship in it and he was eager to give a personal interest in the Church to as many as possible. To the alarm of his wife he urged all who said they could sing to join the choir; worse still a flute-player was told that he could doubtless help as well! Schools had to be built; a night school also was established, at which the Vicar taught once a week. Sometimes in the winter he would give penny lectures, his subjects ranging from Peter the Great to Martin Luther. On Fridays there was evening service in Church when it was Williams' custom to preach if there were more than ten people there apart from the choir. When bad debts and high prices combined to bring the village shop to disaster he had it reorganized as a

co-operative store. A strip of glebe land was given over to allotments. When a young gipsy was found dying in the parish he was commemmorated by a Latin elegy in the burial register. Items such as these, trivial in themselves, may none the less throw interesting sidelights on the occupation of a country parson some ninety years ago. It was while supervising the distribution of coals on Christmas Eve of 1869 that Williams caught a fatal chill. Pneumonia set in and he died on January 18, 1870, in his fifty-third year.

To the end of his life he resented bitterly and intemperately the imputation of heresy that had been cast upon him. He was especially annoyed when the Swiss historian, Merle D'Aubigné, hailed the Bishop of Salisbury—on account of the action he had taken—as a champion of reformed doctrine. 'I cannot ask you, Sir, to accept my assurance,' Williams wrote to him, ' that the Prelate and the friends of the Prelate, who prosecuted me, reject for themselves with the liveliest abhorrence any such "fiction of merit by transfer" as they made it crime in me to have questioned . . . but on examination you will find it to be true; so great was the inconsistency enacted. If you honour Wiltshire by a visit, you may find up lifted crosses and strange coloured stoles at Salisbury —but the doctrines of the Reformation rather at Broad Chalk.'

This was characteristic. Thus Henry Sidgwick describes a meeting with Williams in 1866:

> 'He is much more amiable than you would expect . . . He is evidently quite sincere in thinking that he is one of the very few orthodox clergy in England now . . . The heretics whom fortune has associated with him he tolerates (as an exercise of Christian virtue) but that is all.'

Consequently the breach between him and Bishop Hamilton was never healed, though they came no more into open conflict.

> 'The plenitude of obedience,' he wrote, 'which on principle I measure out to my diocesan in all legal matters, may make me only more vigorous in exacting from him proper abstinence. He has his pound of flesh, but shall have no more.'

These two men present a striking contrast towards one another—the fiery broad church vicar and the stiff Tractarian prelate; but the fact that the richly diversified life of our National Church could find room enough for both of them is perhaps better evidence of its true catholicity than the peculiar doctrines of either of them. Hardly less striking than this is the contrast that Williams presents within himself—the scholar in his study, for example, commentating upon the Prophets, and the pastor teaching the illiterate youth of his parish to spell out the words of Scripture

as they stumble through its text. Yet there is certainly no contradiction here, but rather a moral which we might well take to heart to-day when theology seems often to be in danger of divorcing itself from common life and becoming as specialized and as abstract as so much modern art and poetry.

And finally, although the battles of a century ago are no longer ours, they are not to be dismissed as irrelevant unless it be true that 'history is bunk.' To those who won them we owe a debt of gratitude for freedoms which we have come to look upon as commonplace; a debt to be repaid by using them and guarding them faithfully. Otherwise it may be that the struggle will one day have to be waged all over again.

History is a distorting medium, magnifying some and reducing others irrespective of their true proportions; yet any study of the Victorian era brings to mind irresistibly the words, 'There were giants in those days.'

FREDERICK TEMPLE'S CONTRIBUTION TO ENGLISH MODERNISM

By Rev. F. S. W. Simpson, M.A., F.S.A.

IN 1860 was published *Essays and Reviews*, written by seven members of the Church of England. Amongst the writers were Frederick Temple, then Headmaster of Rugby, Mark Pattison, Jowett, Master of Balliol, the Rev. Rowland Williams and the Rev. H. B. Wilson. The reception accorded to the volume is notorious.

The resolution of Convocation on June 21, 1864, read as follows:

> 'That this Synod, having appointed committees of the Upper and Lower House to examine and report upon the volume entitled *Essays and Reviews,* and the said Committees having severally reported thereon, doth hereby synodically condemn the said volume as containing teachings contrary to the doctrines received by the United Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic Church of Christ.'

It is a tribute to the Liberal Spirit of Gladstone that he dared to appoint Temple to the See of Exeter in 1869, in spite of the indignation he had aroused in clerical circles by contributing to *Essays and Reviews*. Pusey described Temple as having 'participated in the ruin of countless souls' (*Tait* ii, p. 59), and in loyalty to his faith broke his friendship of forty years standing with the Prime Minister. Every legitimate means possible was used to oppose the confirmation of the appointment. The attack of the opposition was led and organised by Bishop Trower.

> 'At a meeting of the English Church Union at Devonport, today (11th October, 1869), a resolution was unanimously adopted, asking the Dean and Chapter to refuse to elect on the *congé d'elire*. Dr. Pusey described the appointment as a "horrible scandal", and denounced as a "miserable excuse" the statement that Dr. Temple ought not to be held responsible for the opinions of his co-essayists. "And now, without any token of repentance, a writer who, by continuing to appear as one of its contributors through all those many editions, made himself responsible before God and man for the evils which ensued, with the blood of all those souls upon his head, having expressed no sorrow that he occasioned others to throw off the faith, is recommended as the guardian of the faith which once he destroyed, as the chief pastor of the sheep whom once he betrayed to the wolf." He suggested the possibility that the Chapter of Exeter and the Bishops, rather than submit to the injunction to elect and consecrate, might prefer to incur the penalty of *praemunire*; but "Disestablishment," he said, "appears to me now our only remedy"; it "must come in ten years at least, and better to be barred of all external help, if need be, now than when paralysed." '
>
> (*The Annals of our Time,* by Joseph Irving, p. 887, 1880.)

The writer of this article has recently come into the possession of the original personal correspondence of the late Dean Goulburn, D.D., D.C.L., (1818—1897), educated at Eton, Scholar of Balliol, 1st Class *Lit. Hum.* Fellow of Merton, 1839—46; Bampton Lecturer 1850, Dean of Norwich 1866/89. He had preceded Temple as Headmaster of Rugby 1850—58.

The following is a copy of the letter sent by Goulburn to Bishop Trower:

My Dear Lord,

Tho' most unwilling to take part in opposition to Dr. Temple's appointment to the See of Exeter (from the extreme kindness and courtesy which he has shown to me on the mere ground of my having preceded him in the headmastership of Rugby School), I cannot feel it consistent with my duty to the Church and to my former pupils at Rugby (who may fairly look up to me for some guidance in the religious questions which agitate the public mind) to stand aloof from the final protest which is to be made, under the sanction of your Lordship, in Bow Church; and I accordingly beg to enclose to you a contribution towards the expenses of that protest.

I quite believe that Dr. Temple does not hold (nay, would personally repudiate) the more objectionable doctrines set forth in *Essays and Reviews;* but while he has allowed numerous editions of that volume to go forth into the world without withdrawing his own Essay, or uttering a single note of disapprobation and will not say a word in answer to the Bishop of Lincoln's touching appeal, to relieve himself from the charges of complicity, I cannot see (with every desire to come to the opposite conclusion) how he is otherwise than responsible for the mischief which the *Essays and Reviews* have avowedly done and are doing.

Of course, our protest, as regards this particular case, will be (and I suppose, under the present relations of Church and State, must be) overruled by the Government. The only good result we can look for is that the manifestation of very strong feeling on the part of Churchmen may be our best security against similar appointments in future. And, as men are constituted, I know no way of evincing strength of feeling so conclusively, as by giving of money in a cause the success of which must be remote and indirect—at all events cannot be immediate.

I remain, my dear Lord, with great respect,
Yours very faithfully,
(signed) E. M. GOULBURN.

The Dean sent a copy of the above letter to Temple at Rugby.

December 8. 'The opponents of Dr. Temple carried out their threat of opposing the confirmation of his election. The ceremony took place at Bow Church, which was crowded to excess, and upward of twenty policemen stationed in different parts of the building. Contrary to the course followed in the Hampden case, the Vicar-General, Sir Travers Twiss, allowed the objectors to be heard; the opposition was chiefly conducted by Dr. Deane, Q.C., who appeared for Bishop Trower and other remonstrants. The arguments lasted two hours, and at the close the Vicar-General

decided that the statute gave him no discretion, and that he was bound to confirm the choice of the Dean and Chapter. If the selection was thought an improper one, it should, he said, have been appealed against at an earlier stage. The usual declaration was then made, and Dr. Temple left the Church, loudly cheered.' (*The Annals of our Time*, by Joseph Irving, p. 894.)

The following day Temple wrote to Goulburn from Rugby:

> My Dear Dean,
>
> Thank you for your straight-forward openness in sending me your letter to Bishop Trower. And thank you, too, for your kind letter to myself.
>
> Let me beg of you to believe that when you speak of kindness and courtesy on my part shown on the mere ground of your having preceded me at Rugby, you very much underestimate my feelings. I cannot but regard you with a warm feeling of the deepest respect for your devotion to the cause of our common Master. Nor is this feeling diminished in the least degree by your conduct in the present instance; especially as you tell me that you are claiming to act on that principle of the supremacy of conscience the assertion of which has been *one* of the grounds of the attack made upon me.
>
> I for my part bid you God speed with all my heart for I know that however we may differ still you are a tried and fine servant of the Lord such as I would wish to be myself.
>
> Yours very truly,
> (signed) F. Exon. (Elect).

Temple's consecration took place on St. Thomas' Day, December 21. Of the occasion Dean Stanly wrote:

'When we entered, the darkness was something beyond all precedent. It was difficult, even with all the lights in the Abbey, to discern one person from another; and so, in the language of a High Church newspaper, "on that darkest day in the whole year was perpetrated the darkest crime which had ever been perpetrated in the English Church".' (p. 372, Voll II, *Life and Letters of Dean Stanley*, by Prothero, 1893.)

It must, however, be added in order to complete the picture, that Bishop Temple, shortly after his consecration, decided to have his essay withdrawn from any further editions of *Essays and Reviews*.

February 9, 1870. 'At the meeting of Convocation to-day, Archdeacon Freeman said that without having been authorised to make a formal announcement to the House, he had received permission from his diocesan to make any use of the information he pleased; and he had therefore to state that Dr. Temple's essay would not appear in any future editions of *Essays and Reviews*, if, indeed, another edition should ever be called for. The Dean of Exeter further explained that Dr. Temple's essay had not

been prepared for publication along with the other essays. Archdeacon Denison thereupon intimated that he 'would surcease from the opposition' he intended proceeding with against Bishop Temple.

On the 11th the Bishop somewhat detracted from the importance of the concession, by explaining that in withdrawing the essay he did not mean any retraction of what he had written, or condemnation of the other essayists. He admitted the book might have done harm—Luther's writings had perhaps done harm—but it had done much more good. It was better, he thought, to allow discussion within the Church than compel it to take an unhealthy form outside.' (*The Annals of our Time*, by Joseph Irving, pp. 903/4.)

Temple's wise words are as vital to-day as ever they were, especially when we notice attempts being made from more quarters than one to impose a totalitarian form of religious thought upon Clergy and lay-people. Unfortunately it is becoming a common practice to describe Clergy as 'disloyal' who dare to question decisions and utterances of Bishops, whether made individually or collectively.

The scholar, the student, the searcher for greater and clearer truth, must be given full liberty to pursue his enquiries and draw his conclusions without fear of victimization.

If the Church of England is to preserve her great Liberal Tradition she must constantly have in front of her the words of Temple addressed to Archbishop Tait:

> 'Such a study, so full of difficulties, imperatively demands freedom for its conditions. To tell a man to study, and yet bid him, under heavy penalties, to come to the same conclusions with those who have not studied, is to mock him. If the conclusions are prescribed, the study is precluded.' (*Life of Tait*, i, p. 291.)

THE PROBLEM OF INTERDENOMINATIONALISM

By the Rev. Ralph Gardner, Vicar of Great Shelford, Cambridge

THE following paper was read as an Anglican contribution to a discussion at a gathering of members of the Society of Friends. It arose from the case of a young doctor who was baptized and confirmed in the course of an Anglican upbringing, but entered upon fundamental religious experience later in the fellowship of the Quakers, becoming a full member of the Society. After several years he was invited by an Anglican missionary society to undertake work in Africa under its auspices. He was unwilling to do anything which might be construed as a denial of the reality of his Quaker experience, while at the same time he felt the invitation to be a call from God. He disclosed his dilemma to 'both sides,' and as a result he is now working happily as a communicant Anglican while retaining full membership in the Society of Friends. This instance—which is not unique—raises some interesting questions, and the gathering referred to was addressed by two brothers, one an Anglican priest, the other a Quaker. The discussion revealed general sympathy with and approval of the doctor's position, though its logical difficulties were recognized and one or two Friends expressed misgivings about it from the Quaker point of view.

* * * *

A distinction has sometimes been made between 'the religions of authority' and 'the religions of the Spirit.' It may be said that though their methods are different, and even inconsistent, they have a common purpose. That purpose is to enable men to make a satisfactory adjustment to life, conceived in its widest terms—or, as it is often phrased, to get into right relations with God. To this end a religion of Authority places a strong, even a primary, emphasis on correctness of belief. An agreed intellectual formulation of doctrines claimed to be 'true' is held to be of fundamental importance; and since such agreement appears to be impossible for the unaided human reason, men are offered such formulations, whether in Creed, Catechism, Confession, or what-not, by institutions which claim an authority superior to that of ordinary reason. There is no doubt that this claim caters for a widespread hunger for spiritual and intellectual security. To be given assurances about God and His manner of dealing with men

by an authority which commands their respect and assent affords to large numbers of people, especially at this stage of history, a much-needed sense of security, or at least of relief from the anxieties and bewilderments of the atomic age.

A religion of the Spirit, on the other hand, is much less concerned with 'correctness of belief.' Its appeal is to something which is held to be fundamental within the human spirit, a divine centre or spark which is the characteristically human 'thing,' which is, despite all the endless varieties of human disagreement and error, the ultimate source of authority and unity. If the religion of the Spirit has anything to do with Creeds and dogmas, it regards them less as precise definitions than as general approximations; not as maps, but rather as signposts; or (to put it in another way) as having the quality of inspired poetry rather than the validity of accurate scientific formulas. In general a religion of the Spirit is suspicious of Creeds and has often dispensed with them altogether. It can co-exist with a wide range of not always intellectually consistent forms of belief. Its appeal is especially to those who are less concerned with the problem of security, those who with whatever reservations retain some confidence in human Reason (with a capital R); and it is aimed primarily at what is conceived to be the universal human capacity for a genuine personal religious experience.

This distinction between 'religion of Authority' and 'religion of the Spirit,' thus briefly summarized, suffers from the faults of all such generalizations; but perhaps it will serve my purpose. It may be wise to add to it that if the characteristic danger of the first is formalism that of the second is spiritual pride. Further, I would say that neither type of religion is often found in what may be called its pure state. Some of the greatest prophets of spiritual religion, some of its profoundest witnesses, have been found among unquestioning adherents of the religion of authority; and I do not doubt that the authoritarian spirit is sometimes found among those who profess to despise a religion claiming external authority.

Now, there is no more powerful or impressive manifestation of the religion of Authority than the Roman Catholic Church. Whatever view we take of that Church, it is admirably designed for its purpose. The centre of its authority is not a Creed or a Bible, open to differences of interpretation, but a living Voice, assumed to be infallible, to which appeal can be made on all matters of doctrine about which differences may arise. Moreover its strength (which is also its weakness) lies in its exclusiveness. For it, the only possible guarantee of salvation open to men is in

submission to and communion with the Holy See of Rome. Thus the refusal of Roman Catholics to take any part with non-Roman Christians in worship or to consider any kind of re-union other than that of complete acceptance of the claims of Rome, is a logical necessity of their position. Therefore 'dual membership' in the sense of a man being at one and the same time a Roman Catholic and a member of any other Christian body whatsoever is quite impossible. A Roman Catholic who took part in a Quaker meeting for worship, or equally in an Anglican service, would be regarded as guilty of mortal sin; and if he obtained membership in either the Society of Friends or the Church of England, he would be treated as an apostate.

At first sight it might appear only a shade less preposterous that a man should be simultaneously a member of the Society of Friends and a communicant of the Church of England. The Anglican Church, historically, traditionally, and liturgically, presents to the world a shape which would seem to put it among the religions of authority. Nor are there lacking Anglicans, clergy and laity, who would tell you that this is so in fact. To them the question whether an Anglican communicant could be also a member of the Society of Friends would appear as absurd as the supposition that a Roman Catholic could be a Quaker without leaving his Church. The Church of England has no clear or single voice, whether of Bishop or Council, to which disputed doctrinal matters can be referred in the expectation of receiving an authoritative judgment. The Anglican must be content with abstractions of authority such as 'the undivided Church' or 'the plain meaning of Holy Scripture.' If I were myself an 'authoritarian' or set any store by the concept of 'infallibility' I own I should find the Church of England a very uneasy sort of Church to live in. But there is no doubt that on the surface at least it must be counted among the manifestations of the religion of authority.

But the Church of England is not greatly concerned about logic. In the earliest stages of its Reformation it created compromises between views and factions which had previously proved irreconcilable. If there can be such a thing as a genius for compromise, the Church of England has got it; whether this is a Good Thing is perhaps a matter of opinion. The fact that the Church of England is 'by law established'—and further, 'by law endowed,' inheriting the buildings, the emoluments, and much of the ordered devotional material of the mediaeval English Church —has held together in formal union a number of theological and liturgical traditions which seem to be radically inconsistent with

with each other. These have developed into three main groups—sometimes called 'High, Low and Broad,' or 'Catholic, Central, and Evangelical.' It is possible to find in the Church of England to-day or even in such a small group of Anglican parishes as constitutes a rural deanery—clergy and laity belonging to all three groups, and even to subdivisions within them. It is often assumed that if (as some Churchmen actualy wish) the Church were disestablished, it would quickly split up into three or more Churches. Whether this would happen is perhaps open to question; but there is no doubt that the peculiar comprehensiveness of the Church of England owes a great deal to the fact of Establishment.

There are those who claim that this comprehensiveness is an inherent weakness; that the apparent unity of the Church of England is at once illogical and fictitious; that a formal unity obtained by such means is not worth having. But there is another side to the picture. First, the disunity of the groups within the Church is not clear-cut. There are in fact other lines of division, horizontal as well as vertical. In each of the groups there is a Liberal element; and indeed there is no Church in Christendom, of the historic shape, which has provided a more congenial home for the Liberal religious spirit. Moreover, in practice there is a remarkable degree of fellowship and mutual respect between the clergy of the different groups. I have been attending ruri-decanal chapters—i.e. gatherings of from a dozen to twenty-five clergy—for over thirty years; and I am sure there has been nothing but gain in the fact that these groups have contained men who, in most other countries, would have been members of different competing churches and who would never have met, as Anglican clergy do, for friendly discussion and consideration of common pastoral problems. The unity of differences which owes so much to the apparently irrelevant fact of Establishment has encouraged an incalculabe amount of practical and personal understanding and tolerance which would simply not have happened if the Church of England had been cut to the ecclesiastical authoritarian pattern.

I have spent some time on these points because they have a strong bearing on our subject of 'dual membership.' Against all appearances, and mostly for inappropriate reasons, the Church of England is in fact one of the most comprehensive and, in the true sense of the word, catholic churches in Christendom. Indeed, Edmund Burke affirmed that the Church of England was 'the only Church in Christendom which professes fallibility.' I say this, not because I am trying to sell it to you, but because I am

trying to show how one Anglican at least can approve and be glad because one of its members is also a member of the Society of Friends. Certainly there are Anglicans who would, if they could, excommunicate or unchurch other Anglicans. There are Anglicans who would regard 'dual membership' as a fatuous or obnoxious impossibility. But fortunately none of them can claim the right to speak with authority. Technically the Church of England retains the machinery of excommunication; but in most respects it has been allowed to get delightfully rusty; and if the question of bringing it into use is ever raised on a practical issue (as it was, for instance, over the late Bishop Barnes), the discussion as to who or what has the right to turn the handle goes on so long and becomes so complicated that generally nothing happens. And the strange thing is that somehow the situation 'works.' Logically untenable, the Anglican Church remains at heart a hospitable, tolerant Church, and that in itself is, I believe, a very great thing.

But the question remains: Why should one who has broken away from 'the religion of authority' and who has found a spiritual home with a body which has always proclaimed 'the religion of the Spirit,' without trappings or trammels, wish, or even be consistently able, to resume full communicant status in the Church of England? I cannot, of course, answer that question from the Quaker point of view. I think it probable that any answer, whether Quaker or Anglican, must be unsatisfactory at the level of discursive reasoning. It would seem on the face of it that the Quaker quiet meeting and the Anglo-Catholic Mass are ways of approach to God so utterly different as to be virtually contradictory. Yet the young doctor we have in mind has written from his mission hospital in Africa that to him the Holy Communion has now more and deeper meaning than it had before he became a Friend, and that he feels no contradiction between what he experiences at the Anglican altar and what he experienced, and expects to experience again, in the Quaker meeting house.

Some months ago a reviewer in the *Times Literary Supplement* (November 5, 1954) dealt with a number of recent books in which the writers gave accounts of their conversion to Christianity, either from agnosticism or from a non-Christian religion. He noted that these conversions had little to do with intellectual convictions. Four of the writers under review, one of them a 'learned and logical Chinese Buddhist scholar,' recalled how, in Walter Pater's story, Marius the Epicurean saw in the house of Cecilia 'the wonderful spectacle of those who believe' and felt 'that the natural soul of worship in him had been satisfied as never before.'

I think it likely that most conversions occur in a similar way,

and that the most powerful missionary weapon (as the reviewer remarked) 'is not preaching or teaching or even the performance of good works, but the public worship of a Christian community.' I imagine that most Quakers, and equally most Catholics, whether Anglo or Roman, who were not born into their religion, would similarly date their conversion from their first encounter with the worshipping fellowship of their respective societies. And I have a theory that the worship of Quakers and the worship of Catholics, which seem to be so completely different in kind and character, both appeal to a worshipping instinct of the same nature and quality. If you were to classify the forms of worship of the many Christian communities along a straight line, as it were, you would probably put the Catholic Mass at one end of it and the Quaker meeting for worship at the other, with every other variety in between. But my theory is that the line, like the astronomers' light, is bent, and that it is really all but a circle, with only a small arc separating Catholic and Quaker.

In the course of my ministry I have known a number of people who have told me that, if they were not Catholic Churchpeople, they would wish to be Quakers—that the only alternative to the Mass they could imagine themselves considering would be the Quaker meeting. This may sound to some absurd, but I have encountered it too often to be able to put it down to mere idiosyncrasy.

Some may remember two books which appeared over thirty years ago—*The Fellowship of Silence* and *The Fruits of Silence* —which resulted from a remarkable association between Quakers and Catholic Anglicans, and in which they co-operated to explore, with deep mutual understanding, the values of silence in public worship. I am inclined to think that the answer to the question of Dual Membership lies just here—in the sphere of religious psychology rather than in that of theology or ecclesiastical order. At the rationalist level the notion of a man being a Quaker and an Anglican at the same time seems ridiculous. At the level of spiritual experience there is no absurdity. Those whose worship moves along the pattern of ancient and hallowed liturgy and those who wait upon God in silent, listening fellowship, find themselves mysteriously at the same place. It is not unthinkable that one person, through an unusual mixture of temperament and circumstances should be able and happy to follow both ways, without wishing or being required to accept either as invalidating the other.

It is unlikely that there will ever be a mass movement towards dual membership; but on the rare occasions when it occurs, I

believe, as an Anglican, that it should be thankfully welcomed. I find it good to know that there are at least some Christians who unite in their own persons and experience two traditions of religious association and worship which are surely separate here only because this is a world of half-lights and shadows.

NEWS OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

BY the time this appears the day of Annual Meetings will already be past and full reports of them will have been published in the *Church of England Newspaper.*

The new organization has now been working for twelve months. This has been largely a year of experiment and enquiry to find what are the most promising ways of advance. Already the lines of progress are beginning to show themselves and there is enough work in hand to keep us occupied at Ironmonger Lane for a long time to come.

In the Annual Report we have a straightforward account of what was done before the end of 1954. Since potential recruits to the Union often want an account of our activities this has been printed separately and extra copies are available if anyone would like to use them for propaganda purposes.

Readers of the *Daily Mail* will have seen that during May Sir Henry Self, writing as the President of the Union, initiated a debate on the question whether the Church was failing the people of this country. He was answered, among others, by Monseigneur Ronald Knox and the Bishop of London. A welcome influx of new members into the Union as a result is an indication of the judgment on the discussion of at any rate a few of those who followed it.

During May we have had an excellent private meeting of the Birmingham Branch at which the Bishop of Birmingham was chairman. Members and friends together made an audience of nearly a hundred. A paper read by the Director was followed by discussion. Plans are in hand for further activities in the Birmingham Branch, among them a public meeting on October 26th. The Bishop will preside and Canon Edward Carpenter of Westminster Abbey will be the speaker.

Studies of the Canon Law question are continuing between ourselves, the A.E.G.M., Church Society and Truth and Faith Committee. Much time has been spent considering what is the best way of expressing effectively the disquiet we all feel. This is difficult to decide because the process of revision is already far advanced.

Attention has tended to fasten on the proposed declaration of obedience which every ordinand and every priest on taking up a new appointment would be required to sign. It states :

'I, A.B., do solemnly make the following declaration : I will obey and abide by the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical of the Church of England as they have been or shall hereafter be passed by the Convocation of the Province of the Church of England in which I may from time to time minister, and duly promulgated with the Royal Assent.'

We feel with remarkable unanimity that this declaration would be dishonest to expect and immoral to make. It does not even contain the usual safeguarding clause 'in all things lawful and honest.' Does this imply that the mantle of moral infallibility has now descended upon those antiquated, inefficient, quarrelsome and bickering bodies, the Convocations? This declaration signs away a man's conscience for the rest of his life to assemblies which are very far indeed from possessing the confidence of Church people. It is also pointed out that this declaration virtually forbids the ordination or the movement from one appointment to another within the Church of any man unless he can assent without qualification to every sentence, every clause, every comma and colon of this tangled growth of regulations, many of which are obsolete before they have half completed the legislative process.

Meanwhile, a small committee of liberal clergy is meeting from time to time in the house of Canon Carpenter to work on the re-statement of our theological principles, a task that has not been attempted for a long time. This, obviously, is not a short-term programme and results of the discussion will be slow in appearing. How those conclusions will eventually be communicated to the public is itself a question requiring much thought. The problem of Authority will be one of the main issues. It is suggested that other groups might form in other parts of the country, each taking a different subject. For instance, it is understood that one such group may devote itself to certain liturgical needs.

Owing to the dissolution of Parliament, new Convocations are being elected. This has meant the postponement of the crucial debate on South India until July. We must ensure that our Joint Statement, prepared with so much labour, is not forgotten. It will

be remembered that the four main points of the Statement can be summarized as follows :

1. Full recognition of all episcopally ordained clergy of the C.S.I. as qualified to exercise their ministry in the Church of England.
2. Acceptance, by the principle of economy, of those ministers of the C.S.I. who have not been episcopally ordained.
3. A declaration that the two churches are 'in communion' with one another in the sense that communicant members of either church will be welcomed to participate in Communion in the other.
4. Rescinding of the requirement that ex-Anglican ministers of the C.S.I. may only be permitted to celebrate the Holy Communion in our churches if they agree not to do so in non-Anglican churches.

CLIFFORD O. RHODES,
Director and Secretary

BOOK REVIEWS

IS INDIA PERSECUTING CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES?

Foreign missionaries in India are in danger of being squeezed out of the country during the coming generation, according to *Newsweek* magazine.*

In the issue appearing May 12, *Newsweek* discloses the growing harassment of Christian missionaries and the eight million Indian Christians by the powerful modern Hindu nationalists, with the acquiescence or at least the silence of the government of Prime Minister Nehru.

In the most complete story yet published on this subject, *Newsweek* reports that Indian government policy toward missionaries shows a sharp trend toward preventing new missionaries from arriving and established missionaries from remaining or returning after furloughs. 'On April 6, according to *Newsweek*, the Indian Government amended its passport rules to provide that missionaries seeking entry must apply for special *visas* and prove "outstanding qualifications"—a good way to freeze out young graduates starting their careers. Further, foreign missionaries returning from furlough must obtain a "no objection to return" certificate, showing they have not come to "adverse notice of the government". Missionaries already in India will be allowed to remain, only if not found guilty of "anti-national activities". The government is curbing the opening of new branches for existing institutions, making it virtually impossible even for a kindergarten to be started in a remote jungle under Christian auspices, without unsnarling New Delhi red tape.'

The story reveals that charges of 'forced conversions . . . of singing immoral songs . . . of gangsterism . . . or of inciting to murder' are frequently brought against the missionaries. Converts are equally harassed by false suits and compelled to testify against the clergy.

'The newly independent country is fiercely nationalistic, and sees in the foreigners remnants of imperialism . . . India's new secular nationalism has its religious counterpart in militant Hinduism. The Hindus' political vehicle is the *Mahasabha*, a group which was banned after one of its members assassinated Gandhi. Mahasabha is vigorous to-day in the Shuddhi movement, which seeks the reconversion of Moslems and Christians, and foreign Christian leadership offers a convenient scapegoat.'

The above citations and summaries from the *Newsweek* Press Release seem to me to contain some truth, together with a good deal of error.

1. It is quite true that there is a section of Indian opinion which is definitely anti-Christian, as well as anti-Muslim and anti-foreign. Its slogan is: 'India for the Hindus!' It is led by the Hindu Mahasabha, the Rashtriya Seva Sangh, and other Hindu organizations, some of which are prepared to adopt 'terrorist' methods to achieve their aims—witness the assasination of Gandhi, and the attempts already made on the life of Nehru, whom they regard as too friendly to Muslims and Christians. If this party gained control of the Government of India, they probably *would* expel all non-Hindu missionaries, and try to 're-convert' Christians into the fold of Hinduism.

2. But this 'Hindu communalism' does not represent the whole of India. It is strongly opposed by Nehru and the Congress Party on the one hand, and by the Communists on the other.

3. There is, however, a widespread dislike of Christian *evangelistic* work in India, even among those who welcome the social, medical and educational work of Christian Missions. This is because, if Christian evangelism leads (as it has, in the past) to mass-movements out of the Hindu community into the Christian Church, it is feared that it may lead to communal tensions,

* Morris House, Jermyn Street, S.W.1.

and even riots, and embitter relations between the communities, thereby impairing the unity of India. Nehru himself, widely respected as a man of exceptional integrity and fair-mindedness, is himself an agnostic in matters of religion, tolerant of all creeds, but committed to none; and he, while determined to try and secure *fair* treatment for Christian, Muslim and Hindu alike, is definitely opposed to anything that savours of 'proselytism' from one religious system to another.

4. There is throughout India a widespread suspicion of the United States of America, including American missionaries, who are regarded as potential political agents, anxious to persuade India to abandon her political neutrality and declare herself on the anti-Communist side in the world-struggle for power. Passport visas for American evangelistic missionaries have been refused of late in a number of cases. This suspicion of the U.S.A. is partly unjustifiable, but is due to several causes: (1) the American pact with (and aid to) Pakistan; (2) the narrow Fundamentalism of many of the American missionaries, which often leads them to adopt an intolerant and tactless attitude towards the ancient religions and culture of India; and (3) the undoubted fact that many (though not all) Americans do regard anti-Communism as an *essential* part of Christianity. Some British missionaries hold similar views; but I think most of them are content to leave India to determine her own political policy; and some of them even welcome India's position as a neutral in the present world-strife. Hence they are viewed by India with much more friendly eyes than their American colleagues. But British missionaries, too, have now to obtain a special visa for permission to enter India.

5. The *Newsweek* statement takes no account of the fact that India as a whole is more friendly to Britain to-day than she ever was under British rule, and shows real appreciation of Britain's action (unique in history) in withdrawing from India without recourse to arms to defend her Empire. To say (as *Newsweek* does) that India to-day 'is fiercely nationalistic, and sees in foreigners remnants of Imperialism' seems to me a travesty of the facts. I should rather say that now that India has won her independence, her old nationalism is greatly chastened; and instead of hating all foreigners as oppressors, she is ready to welcome those of them who will come as her friends and helpers.

6. I think the Christian Church in India is to-day confronted with a searching challenge: if it is content to 'live and let live', as one community among others in India, it may be reasonably sure of a place—even an honoured place—among the religions of India, and invited to make its distinctive contribution to the national life as a whole. But if it feels an obligation to *evangelise* those of other faiths, and to urge them to come out from their ancestral communities, and if this should lead (as it has, in the past) to mass-movements out of Hinduism (or Islam) into the Christian Church—then I think that this will arouse strong opposition from all the non-Christian communities, which may lead to real persecution of the Church, and perhaps the expulsion of foreign missionaries from India. That is a challenge such as we in England have never had to face; and the Church in India needs our prayers that it may be faced aright.

E. C. Dewick

BELIEF AND UNBELIEF SINCE 1850

We recently received a request to send to a Belgian Jesuit, Professor of Theology, a list of the dozen best books on Anglican theology produced in recent years. We felt unable to comply in the precise terms of the request and wrote that the three modern Anglican scholars whose writings we valued

most highly were Hastings Rashdall, Bethune-Baker and Bishop Hunkin and in this class we commended especially Rashdall's Bampton Lectures on the Atonement. We suggested, however, that the Belgian should consult Professor H. G. Wood's latest volume, *Belief and Unbelief since 1850,** and take particular note of his opening paragraph which runs thus:

> 'Moreover, the book of Vernon Storr, *Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century up to 1860*, with its sequel, *Later Nineteenth Century English Theology*, by Dr. L. E. Elliott-Binns, taken along with C. C. J. Webb's masterly study of *Religious Thought in England since 1850*, and the late J. K. Mozley's *Some Tendencies in British Theology, from the publication of Lux Mundi to the Present Day*, makes it superfluous for me to try to do over again indifferently what has already been done so well.'

We first discovered H. G. Wood as a new luminary in our English theological firmament in his brilliant brochure: *Why Mr. Bertrand Russell is not a Christian.* Thereafter we read everything of his which came our way: it was not little. The titles of twenty-two of his books appear under his name in *Who's Who.*

His latest volume *Belief and Unbelief since 1850* is an amazingly valuable summary of modern Christian apologetic abounding with citations and criticisms which arrest attention and stick in the memory of the reader as much by their lucidity as by their profundity.

If we are to make comparisons, perhaps his first lecture entitled '1850 and 1950 a contrast' and his last lecture 'The quest for the Jesus of history and the return to the Christ of faith' are the most illuminating for those who ask, as did Pliable in the Slough of Despond: 'Ah! neighbour Christian, where are you now?' But the reader of Dr. Wood's volume will not reply as did Bunyan's Christian: 'Verily I do not know', but in the words of Bunyan's Evangelist: 'Do you see yonder shining light? ... Keep that light in your eye and go up directly thereto.'

We conclude our commendation with one citation from the first lecture and several from the last.

> 'Biblical allusions in public speeches are risky nowadays. They are so seldom appreciated. Would the present House of Commons understand John Bright's allusion to the Cave of Adullam if it were made to-day? Indeed, a distinguished French historian, in recording the incident, misinterprets it in a footnote which says, *"Allusion Biblique; Adullam a voulu tuer David"*.

> H. W. Nevinson sums it up thus: "For good or evil, it is evident that such knowledge of the Bible as was our possession when I was young is fast fading away. If, when speaking from a public platform, I make some passing allusion to the Bible, I see from the blank faces of the audience that they do not understand what on earth I am talking about". He adds that F. L. Lucas, in his journal, says much the same thing. The passage runs: "Clearly the Old Testament is wilting in the fierce chaos of the hydroelectric age. Morality may not lose much, but I fear literature will. For the Hebrew sacred books, especially in their Jacobean English, have a grandeur missing in most modern work".' (p. 4).

> 'If recent research modifies the thoroughgoing eschatology of Scheitzer and Loisy, it also supplies some corrective of the Form-critics' assumption that we cannot discern the figure of the historic Jesus through the mists of even primitive tradition. In this connection, I judge that the work of

**Belief and Unbelief since 1850*, by Prof. H. G. Wood (C.U.P., 1955; 12/6.)

C. H. Dodd and Joachim Jeremias of Göttingen on the parables constitutes a new and important development in the critical study of the Gospels. They demonstrate the truth of Matthew Arnold's dictum that Jesus was above the heads of his reporters.'

'If we can discern original meanings and applications of which those who recorded the parables were unaware, or only half-aware, we may get back to the very words of Jesus and reach a better understanding of his message.'

'Christ will not force our judgement. He takes his Kingdom with entreaty, and keeps it with lowliness of mind. He seeks the unforced devotion of loyal hearts. And those who love and follow Christ will know the living and true God.' (pp. 135–140).

H.D.A.M.

CHRISTIAN SAINTS: ANCIENT AND MODERN

If, according to Tertullian, the blood of martyrs is the seed of Christians (*semen Christianorum*) the lives of the saints are the spiritual nutriment of their fellow-Churchmen. The Church authorities recognized this from the outset and St. Luke in his *Acts of the Apostles* was the first of a long line of Church historians to contribute to this need.

On the saints days inserted in the Church's Calendar, selections from the life of the saint to be commemorated were appointed to be read. These selections were called the *Legends of the Saints* (*Legendum* means that which ought to be read)—the most notable of these selections was the *Acta Sanctorum* compiled in the thirteenth century. Owing to the incredibilities in these authorized readings legend became synonymous with unhistorical and in the Churches of the Reformation these lives of the saints ceased to be read liturgically. But in the Papal Church the practice continued and lives of the saints were written to meet this need. In the post Reformation period the Jesuit Bollandists produced a collection of some 2,000 saintly lives in their 60 folio volumes of *Acta Sanctorum*.

With the Oxford Movement interest in the lives of the saints revived amongst English Churchmen. This produced our *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, by Wm. Smith and Henry Wace (new impression 1900, John Murray) consisting of four solid closely printed quarto volumes covering the first eight centuries of Church History.

For the millenium which has since elapsed no systematic Anglican hagiography has been produced and really there is no need for it. A great number of saintly Christian lives of non-Roman Catholic Christians have been written and published and many of these could not have secured the Papal Imprimatur since they do not support the Invocation of Saints nor demand miracle as a necessary testimony to saintship nor the accumulation of saintly relics as a desirable practice. The influence exerted in England by John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (*Actes and Monuments*) which went through four editions in his lifetime (1516–1587) and Charles Kingsley's *Westward Ho!* and *The Saint's Trajedy* dealt blows to hierarchic saintship from which it is only now beginning to recover. This recovery is testified to by the contemporary publication of the series entitled *The Makers of Christendom*, by a firm of Roman Catholic publishers (Sheed and Ward) of which the General Editor is Christopher Dawson.

Another contemporary English publication of saintly biographies which has secured the Papal Imprimatur demands mention. It is *Saints for our Times*, by Theodore Maynard (Staples Press Ltd., 1953; 15/-). It enshrines the lives of eighteen saints from the twelfth to the twentieth century. The

modern saints included, e.g. St. Rosa of Lima (1586–1617), St. Bernadette of Lourdes (1844–1879), St. Francis Xavier Cabrini (1850–1917), who are most attractively presented and well worthy of study.

Of the other saints included we may here only refer to St. Ignatius Loyola (1492–1556) whose Catholic comprehensiveness is summarised in the following dictum:

> 'The first object was to drive no person out of the pale of the Church. Since there were bad people, it was better that they should be bad Catholics than bad Protestants' (p. 112).

H.D.A.M.

PROFESSOR WIDGERY ON RELIGION

The title of this book, *What is Religion?** if enunciated with the proper emphasis, might be made to convey two quite different views of its subject. It could express a straightforward enquiry and presuppose an informative reply. But it could also be asked in the manner in which Pilate asked his famous question about truth and by the very intonation indicates the essential cynicism of the inevitable answer. Of these two ways of asking the question that of the author, who holds the Chair of Philosophy in Duke University, U.S.A., is definitely of the former order; indeed we have his own words in the Preface:

> 'The purpose of the present volume is not inspirational. I have undertaken my task as a philosophical thinker. That task is to give an answer to the question, repeatedly asked: "What is Religion?".'

A more profound, complicated and comprehensive question could scarcely be framed, and it is with considerable curiosity that one turns to see what is the answer given in some three hundred pages. In general estimate it may perhaps be said at the outset that Professor Widgery provides some shrewd comment on many of the issues involved and gives evidence of a remarkable knowledge of the phenomenology of religion, especially in its Indian forms. His subject is professedly the Philosophy of Religion, which he seems to regard as a kind of Cinderella among the academic disciplines, and he accordingly defines his field relative to some of these other disciplines:

> 'Philosophy of Religion starts from religion as distinctive, to be differtiated from the intellectual grasp of truths, and from moral and aesthetic experiences. As Philosophy of Nature starts from sense experience of the physical world and Moral Philosophy from moral judgement, so Philosophy of Religion begins with religion in its own intrinsic nature.'

The data to be employed in this undertaking are provided by the kindred disciplines of the Psychology of Religion, History of Religions, and the Comparative Study of Religions.

Professor Widgery significantly closes with his subject by way of a discussion of the meaning of history:

> 'Religion is a constituent of history, and it has implications as to the significance of history. Philosophy of Religion is more closely related to Philosophy of History than to any other departmental philosophy.'

The reason for this is that

> 'Though religion is a constituent of history, in its non-primitive forms it has always involved some kind of interpretation of history.'

Right as he surely is in his appreciation of the basic significance of the interpretation of history in the evolution of the higher forms of religion, to the

* *What is Religion?*, by A. G. Widgery. (Allen and Unwin, London, 1954. Pp. xi+330; price 18/-.)

mind of the present reviewer Professor Widgery has here failed to follow the most valuable clue to the solution of the problem with which he concerns himself. Instead of the brief reference which he makes to the difference between the Christian and Islamic interpretation of history, it is submitted that he should have investigated at length the various attitudes towards the phenomena of temporal change which have been adopted severally in the religions of mankind, because from such an enquiry would have emerged the key-fact of man's consciousness of Time as the primary cause of his agelong search for security, both physical and spiritual.

Professor Widgery is very concerned to refute the view of the philosophically-minded that religion is essentially a complex of ideas which men conceive about their place in the world of their experience. Accordingly he has some wise things to say about the nature of revelation—thus:

> 'The scriptures do not represent men as first carrying on philosophical reflection to establish the existence of God and on acceptance of something as proof embarking on religious relations with God. They describe religious relations with God, on the basis of which ideas were formed in later reflection.'

And he insists upon the need of studying carefully and sympathetically the sacred scriptures of the various religions, since only by so doing is some insight to be had into the original quality of the religious experience which produced them. However, at the end of this section he throws out the warning:

> 'Leaders in all religions are relatively too much occupied with their ancient sacred scriptures.'

In the chapter entitled 'Man: his Nature, Origin, and Destiny' it is stated that,

> 'All religions acknowledge that the life of man on earth is imperfect, including sufferings, discontent, and discord. They maintain that it is due, at least in part, to man's nature itself being defective.'

This statement raises for the present writer the question of the wisdom of confining any comparative study of religion, as Professor Widgery apparently does, to those religions at present surviving in the world. Here, for example, we have an instance of what are called 'dead' religions exhibiting a significant phenomenon which is not to be found among 'living' religions. The case in point is that in both ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia the chief evil which afflicted man, namely, death, was not so accounted for: the subject is an exceedingly complicated one, but its significance is great, seeing that these ancient religious systems survived each for some three millenia.

With so complex a subject to handle it is not surprising that Professor Widgery should meet with disagreement from other scholars on many points; but this fact should not deflect attention from the general value of his discussion of the fundamental issues involved, and it is tempting to give a *catena* of quotations from his many acute observations and wise comments. The best service will probably be rendered by concluding with a brief account of the answer which he makes to the original question: 'What is Religion?'. What he calls the 'primary meaning in religion' is 'the experience of God, communion with and love and praise of Him'. The second is 'man's experience of himself as a mind not to be identified with the body or any portion of it'. The next is found 'in accepting and interpreting Nature as created by God, and responding to it as instrumental to the purposes of God for men in the ideal He reveals to them'. The fourth 'meaning' is 'the sharing in social life, not primarily as a result of biological processes or for secular benefits, but as a fundamental of the religious idea'. Then there is 'the experience of peace, and

bliss in the communion of men as minds with God as a mind'; next 'the acceptance of saintliness, moral goodness, truth, and beauty in all their forms, as divinely intended for men'. What is called the 'seventh meaning in religion' is 'the individual's consciousness of defect, especially of Sin, together with an awareness of the way of salvation, and—at least in part—an experience of salvation'. An attitude towards suffering is also enumerated, and so is 'the conviction of spiritual continuity beyond death' and all which that implies.

In some ways Professor Widgery's book is a difficult one to read, but, since it is concerned with a question which must interest all, it inevitably commands attention, if not always approval.

S. G. F. Brandon

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

The painstaking method of linguistic analysis is a good servant if a bad master; it has done much for philosophy even if its total value is likely to be too difficult to assess for some time to come, and it is only when scholars mistake the method for the end and believe that a mere explication of the linguistic facts is all that is necessary that the method should seem to deserve censure. So also theologians who study concordance and lexicon are guilty of presenting us with erudition but no light if they study only these; but those who use concordance and lexicon in their study of doctrine in the New Testament may exhibit both, and it is an undeserved fate if their method obscures for many readers their real discoveries. For as linguistic analysis in philosophy may well show us what we are talking about, so in a roughly parallel manner careful analysis of S. Paul's writings will show us what he meant, what concepts, conscious or unconscious, he had in mind, when he used his famous metaphors.

Dr. Best has undertaken just such a study of S. Paul's idea of the one Body in Christ,[1] and his examination has yielded such useful results that the book may be used for reference (for there are full indices). But there is of course a main theme: if we ask how the believer is linked with Christ and so appropriates the efficacy of Christ's actions, which is perhaps a way of putting the main problem of Christian doctrine, we can begin to understand this on the basis of racial solidarity which becomes a sense of corporate personality: ' . . . "with Christ" suggests to us the inclusion of Christians in Christ: what happens to Him — death, resurrection, etc.— happens to them; in this they are "solid" with Him' (p. 57). It is of course baptism which 'brings us into our share in Christ's death; it therefore makes us part of the inclusive personality which is Christ' (p. 66). ' . . . to be baptized into Christ is to become a member of the Christian community which is "in Christ"' (p. 70).

The Church as the Body of Christ is one of a number of metaphors: it is not and cannot be ontologically 'Body of Christ, bride, temple, olive tree. In a certain sense we can say it is each of these — but not finally and completely to the exclusion of the others' (p. 99). Any dualistic notion which suggests that the Church is the Body of Christ because his instrument is rejected: 'the metaphor . . . is concerned with the structure of the Church and not with its work' (p. 111). Christ cannot be completely identified with nor completely distinguished from His Church. The insistence that the metaphor applies to the Church's structure and not to its work has perhaps prevented Dr. Best from seeing that though this interpretation may well be faithful to what was in S. Paul's mind, there is for his readers at least an

[1] *One Body in Christ.* A study in the relationship of the Church to Christ in the epistles of the apostle Paul. By Ernest Best, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. (S.P.C.K. 1955; 25/-.)

implication that the Church as an organism is an instrument. This seems to be admitted in the following passage on p. 148: 'Thus we conclude that the Church does not include "all things", but only redeemed humanity. But the Church is used to make known God's redemption to "all things" (iii, 10) so that all may be brought to a Head in Christ (i, 10)' (the references are here to *Ephesians*). A footnote to the word 'used' adds 'Probably in a passive way' and directs us to p. 189, n.1, where *Eph.* iii, 10 is discussed. No doubt the Church is used passively here; but if, as the author holds, the Church's activity in the world is — or ought to be — the activity of Christians who go out from her and return to her for refreshing life (pp. 201–2), and if the Church 'is not the place to which Christians go to escape the world; it is the place from which they go (if they can really be said to leave it; rather it goes with them) to bring Christ to the world' (p. 202)— then their activity may surely be regarded as activity of the Church, since it is rightly insisted that there is no such thing as an individual Christian. If the Church both is and yet is to be, 'baptized into Christ', and yet needing to 'grow up into Him' (p. 87), the growing up cannot be thought of only as the qualitative growth which the author describes, but must be also that activity of an organism which assimilates alien material to itself, in this case not by destruction of that material but by loving addition.

In connection with this point it is worthwhile mentioning that the discussion of sanctification (pp. 77-78) in its meaning as bringing another member into the *soma*, which is the corporate personality, which in some sense is Christ, and the subsequent treatment of *Gal.* iii, 16, 28, 29 miss the point that for S. Paul to be Christ's is instrumental to being Abraham's seed and so heirs to the promise (see *Gal.* iii, 29; iv, 6-7).

It would be interesting to have Dr. Best's reply to this criticism, which cannot do anything to detract from a book which pre-eminently is of the kind whose usefulness will be discovered in having recourse to it. Such an approach to the problem of the nature of the Church is sympathetic to Anglicanism in its historical form: there is nothing which conflicts with the conception of a 'congregation of faithful men', and the objective examination of scripture leads to ideas asking for our consideration rather than demanding their acceptance. It is by thus studying together afresh the documents of the faith rather than by confronting one another with rival docrines fully fledged that progress can be made in the oecumenical field.

ROBERT LEANEY

THE EUCHARISTIC WORDS OF JESUS*

In 1935 Prof. Joachim Jeremias of Göttingen published in German the results of his research on Eucharistic origins. His treatise, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, augmented by the addition of new material and supplemented by his revised conclusions has been republished in an English translation in 1955 with a commendatory Preface by Dr. John Lowe, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford.

All students of our Gospels are aware that the Synoptic Gospels agree in placing the Institution of the Eucharist at the Passover meal celebrated by Jesus with the Apostles on the eve of His crucifixion, whereas the Fourth Gospel has been interpreted as recording the last meal of Jesus with His

* *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, by the Reverend Joachim Jeremias, Professor of New Testament Studies, University of Göttingen. Translated by the Rev. A. Ehrhardt with an Introduction by the Very Rev. John Lowe, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1955; 18/-.)

Apostles before His passion, as taking place twenty-four hours earlier and as not including any account of the Institution of the Eucharist.

Against this conclusion Wellhausen maintained that 'bread' (*artos*) in *Mk.* xiv, 22, could not be used of unleavened bread. Jeremias cites examples that *artos* was used of unleavened bread.

Jeremias maintains that *Mk.* xiv, 22–24 omits the paschal lamb and bitter herbs because it is a Christian cultic formula that Mark is citing, not a Jewish paschal regulation.

The description of the ritual in *Mk.* xiv, 22, is inconsistent with paschal ritual. In paschal ritual Maimonides stated that the bread was broken before the blessing. Jeremias retorts that if this was the case in the days of Maimonides it was not the custom in the period of the institution of the Eucharist —blessing came first. 'Grace before meat.'

Again, it has been objected that for all to drink from one cup as *Mk.* relates was not a paschal custom. Jeremias shows that it was a common custom in the days of Jesus but that it was only later that separate cups were permitted for hygienic reasons. The objection that as each of the paschal diners had a plate of his own they could not have dipped a sop into a common dish of sauce is equally unsubstantiated.

The phrase 'not during the feast' in *Mk.* xiv, 2, is ambiguous as the plans of the Sanhedrin were no doubt adjusted later to suit the treacherous design of Judas. To the objection that the Crucifixion and the public events attending it could not have taken place on Nisan 15 as this was a holy day, and treated as a sabbath, is confuted by Dalman and Billerbeck whose authority as Rabbinical scholas stands very high (Jeremias, p. 49 *op. cit.*).

John xviii, 12 *et seq.* states that the Crucifixion took place before the Passover. Of this conflict between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists, Jeremias, after an intricate consideration of the evidence, writes:

> 'The Johannine report, therefore, is not uniform. Rather does it show, alongside the dating of the Last Supper on the eve of the Passover—which is only unambiguously stated in *John* xviii, 28—traces of another tradition, according to which the Last Supper was a Passover' (p. 56).

Our own interpretation of this conflict of date between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel is that the Synoptists are historically accurate and that for the writer of the Fourth Gospel Symbolism was more important than chronology and the identification of the Crucifixion of Jesus, the Slaying of the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, was vastly more important for John than the minute adherence to chronological accuracy.

> 'While there were hundreds and thousands of paschal lambs being killed in the Temple, the true Paschal Lamb, of whom according to the will of God no bone should be broken, died unrecognized outside the gates of the city' (p. 56).

But why did the author of the Fourth Gospel omit the Institution of the Eucharist from his account of the Last Supper and substitute for it the Washing of the Disciples' Feet? (*Jn.* xiii, 5). Why also did he append to the Feeding of the Five Thousand the discourse of Jesus on Himself as the Bread of Life and conclude it with the significant utterance: 'The Words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life? (*Jn.* vi, 63).

Was it because the writer of the Fourth Gospel feared the development of materialistic sacramentalism in the Church which also prompted him to write of the greatest of the Christian Sacraments 'Although Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples'. (*Jn.* iv, 2).

We could wish Professor Jeremias had dealt more fully with the sacramentalism (or anti-sacramentalism) of the Fourth Gospel. Professor Jeremias summarises his thesis as follows:

> 'The accounts of the Last Supper, as we have them in the four Gospels to-day, are seen to be the outcome of a living process of Growth in the tradition.' (p. 71).

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CONVERTING POWER OF M.R.A.

Sir,

My vicar showed me the March issue of *The Modern Churchman* with your extremely positive editorial on M.R.A. and I should like to thank you for the stand you take and for your thoughts on it.

It was through Moral Re-armament that I came to take office as Vicar's Warden in St. George's Parish, Edgbaston. Previous to this I took no interest in the Church nor had anything to do with it until in 1948 I went to Caux. There I realized what it was all about. I came home, was Confirmed and ultimately took office first as Peoples' Warden and then as Vicar's Warden.

The Church Assembly criticism, far from putting me off M.R.A., has made me more than ever determined to fight for it because I think it is what the nations are really hungry for. If it could do for me what it has done, then it can do it for everyone, everywhere.

Your magazine deserves to go into every clergyman's home in the country.

M. H. Homer

Sir,

In support of your defence of the spiritual and moral value of M.R.A., published in your March issue, I venture to send you my testimony, published in my parish magazine.

> 'Last July I was asked at short notice to join a delegation of clergy and ministers from Industrial areas to attend the World Conference of Moral Rearmament in Switzerland.
>
> I am thankful I was able to accept and grateful to those who made it possible for me to be there for almost a week.
>
> Many of us are deeply concerned about the state of the world and the perplexing problems which confront us. All of us should be. Most people have personal problems of one kind and another as well. Few of us, however, see their close and intimate connection. Yet here was a gathering from many different nations and representing a variety of religious backgrounds and beliefs, who were convinced that they had found the answer, were anxious at all costs to live it out in practice and to pass it on.
>
> Briefly, the answer referred to is God. Not thought of as a distant deity, a theological formula, the result of a philosophical argument, a last resort, or even a very present help in trouble! But as one who speaks to us and guides us, and makes us to be "of one mind in a house".
>
> For how can the nations be better than the individuals who compose them? Have we, for example, most decidedly disapproved of dictators but tolerated dictatorship in ourselves? Has a man any right to expect to command any situation, at home, in business, in club, trades union, party or church, if he is not in command of himself?

In a sense nothing new was said, no new movement was instigated, no new philosophy explained. But here was a pattern of living, thinking, praying, speaking, acting, being worked out, which is adequate to meet the deepest human needs under all conditions. Call it an ideology if you like. Without it, whatever you call it, democracy looks like going by default. The truth and goodness of God was demonstrated as available for all of us, "new every morning", in the sense of fresh rather than newfangled, unfailing and always ready for use. This we can experience if we are prepared to accept his standards in all things and obey his voice.

The travail of our times is very great. What kind of a world will be born? In order to assist in the birth of a world which has love, honesty, purity and unselfishness as its standards we certainly need to be remade. What is the alternative? That is worth thinking out. "He that is not with us is against us". The time is late.

Such are some of my thoughts after spending a few days at Caux and meeting delegates from all over the world. There is much more to say, much more to be worked out. It was an unforgettable and invigorating experience'. A.L.B.

MONSIGNOR KNOX ON THE RESURRECTION

SIR,

Monsignor Knox, in his article in the *Daily Mail*, states that 'Actually the Empty Tomb was the first claim made, the first message preached by the missionaries of our religion'. But the first written missionary document that deals in detail with the Resurrection is St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians in which the writer gives a list of occasions when the risen Christ 'appeared' to various people, but does not mention the empty tomb, nor does he refer to it in any of his statements about the Resurrection.

GUY KENDALL

Little Hanger, Wormley, Godalming.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF HINDUISM

SIR,

All inspiration that awakens a spiritual response comes from God. If Christians turn their backs on some inspiring message merely because it comes from another religion, are they not the losers? I have sampled several from time to time, but always I find that the most satisfying quotations come from Hinduism, which is, I believe, the oldest of the great religions. What Christian can read unmoved that wonderful description of God from the *Mundakapanished II*? Referring to God it says 'Not above nor below nor in the midst can He be comprehended. Nor is there any similitude for Him whose name is infinite glory, not with the sight is established His form, none may by the eye behold Him. They who know Him by the heart and by the mind dwelling in the heart, become immortal'.

Meditation and worship in the heart seems to be a characteristic of Hinduism, and I often wonder if many people could not the more easily reach their Lord in the heart which is the region of feeling. As the blind feel their way to something to hold on to, so may we feel for the presence of God in our hearts in a way that our minds are unable to reach.

Then there is that wonderful little book, *The Bhagavad Gita* (The Lord's Song), where Krishna speaking as God's messenger in the first person says: 'He who seeth Me everywhere and seeth everything in Me, of him will I never lose hold and he shall never lose hold of Me.'

We get a vast picture of Deity in this scripture, but if its transcendence chills as if something far away, there is the significant phrase, ' He is minuter than the atom ' reminding us of Tennyson's great line, ' Closer is He than breathing.'

Finally, we get the consoling lines: 'However men approach Me, even so do I accept them for the path men take from every side is Mine.' (4th discourse).

HELEN BUCHANAN

49 Alexandra Road,
Well End, Barnet

WHAT DID JESUS HOPE FOR?

SIR,

In his review of Dr. Roderic Dunkerley's book *The Hope of Jesus* in your December issue, the Rev. D. L. Scott adversely criticises the author's suggestion identifying—or rather, associating—the Kingdom of God with Social Progress and the Welfare State. But, I would ask, how otherwise can we translate 'Kingdom of God' into modern thought and action? Mr. Scott went on to say that 'the Kingdom of God is something more than a kingdom of human aspiration', and then suggested that in this book 'the distinction between them does tend to become unduly blurred'.

But, as I see it, if God is *within* His universe, and supremely within the personality of Man, what higher aspiration *can* there be than *human* aspiration?

Mr. Scott then referred to the 'spread of barbarism' in recent years. Would it not be more true to fact to say that to-day we are all of us much more morally sensitive than were those good folk of sixty or seventy years ago, and that what happens to-day is that acts of barbarism are publicly denounced *as such*, and are universally condemned? In the late Victorian era, in which I was born and brought up, well-filled churches existed side by side with squalid poverty and hunger, dreadful slums, much illiteracy, and much 'barbarism' in our relations and action towards other peoples, especially coloured peoples. To-day we are far more honest and sincere, which, in my view, is a true sign of progress; splendid evidence of a steady advance towards the building of the Kingdom of God—on earth.

Isn't this what Jesus meant when He declared that the Kingdom is *within us*?

MALCOLM RUTT

3 Cumberland Court, Wallace Avenue, Worthing.

THE EPISTOLARY FORM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Question

SIR,

I have often wondered over what might seem to be a very simple matter—but which I have never seen adequately explained in any book on the New Testament that I have read. On what model were the letters which we have in the New Testament formed? Were such writings commonly to be found in the literature of that period? Did philosophers, religious teachers, etc., have the habit of addressing their audiences in that manner or did the Apostles create a new type of literature by these writings?

Did the writings of the Old Testament prophets give the New Testament writers a model for such writings?

That men in the first century did write books—treatises—and letters of course one knows—but my question rather is, were the letters of the New Testament *sui generis* or did they conform to the ordinary pattern?

C. H. D. GRIMES

Newton Ferrers Rectory, Devon.

Answer

In Graeco-Roman society the epistolary form was employed for a wide variety of purposes. Apart from communications between private persons, written on papyrus, which have been preserved by chance on Egyptian sites, we know of letters which were definite literary compositions, designed for ultimate publication, in which the authors set forth their views on current affairs, on philosophy and art; of such an order are the letters of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny and M. Antonius. The epistolary form was also used for conveying official injunctions and views, a notable example of which is the Letter of the Emperor Claudius to the citizens of Alexandria. Other types of this *genre* are the 'magical letters' and what has been termed *Himmelsbriefe*, which purposed to convey esoteric knowledge of a divine origin.

In the New Testament we have examples of several of these forms of writing. From II *Cor.* iii, 1 we learn that Paul's opponents (undoubtedly the leaders of the Mother Church of Jerusalem) were accustomed to arm their emissaries with commendatory letters, and it is probable that behind *Acts* xv, 23–29 there lies a recollection of the ruling on matters of faith and practice which the Jerusalem community sent out in epistolary form. The genuine Epistles of Paul are modelled on the accepted epistolary pattern, but the Apostle's use of this form of communication might fairly be regarded as creating a new type, namely, the Pastoral and Encyclical Letter. The other Epistles of the New Testament canon are clearly more artificial compositions; in particular we may note that the letters to the Seven Churches in *Rev.* ii-iii, have the form of the *Himmelsbriefe*.

A good recent account of the subject is given by J. Schneider in his article entitled *Brief* in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* Band II (Stuttgart, 1954).

S. G. F. BRANDON

University of Manchester.

REVISED MARRIAGE SERVICE

SIR,

It seems to me that your Revised Marriage Service is right in upholding the sanctity of marriage, but that the contracting parties ought not to be bound to maintain the marriage under any circumstances, seeing that St. Matthew's Gospel permits divorce in the case of adultery (*Mt.* v, 32; xix, 19) and that our English law also authorises divorce for the same cause. I suggest that the phrases 'So long as ye both shall live' and 'Until death us do part' be omitted from the marriage vows in your revised marriage service.

Archbishop Frederick Temple maintained that the marriage vows taken by the bridegroom and bride constitute a covenant between them and that therefore the breaking of the covenant by one party releases the other party from the covenant.

In the marriage service of 1662 this covenant character of the marriage vows is recognized by the use of the word 'covenant' in the priest's prayer

after the giving of the ring—'That these persons may surely perform and keep the vow and covenant betwixt them made'.

I would also suggest that as an alternative to the 'Grace' at the end of the service a form of blessing be substituted: 'Almighty God bless, preserve and keep you that ye may live together in holy love unto your lives end. Amen'.

Neither the Bishops nor the Convocations have any legal right to forbid the marriage of divorced persons in our churches or to repel them from Holy Communion. Watchfulness is the price of liberty and Modern Churchmen have as much right to avail themselves of their legal rights as others.

Thus amended the use of such a form as you suggest might be sanctioned just as the 1928 Form of Service is allowed and very largely used; 1662 being the exception rather than the rule.

L. D. GRIFFITH

Barford St. Martin Rectory, Salisbury.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

We have also received with other comments a letter from the Rev. J. Pearce-Higgins, Vicar of Putney, pointing out the serious absence of the word 'home' from our revised marriage service. As a result of comment and criticism we are publishing as an inset in this issue a corrected revision of the marriage service.

ED. M.C.

Modern Churchmen's Conference

The 38th Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen is to be held at Somerville College, Oxford, from July 25 to 29, 1955, the theme for discussion being 'Man: His Nature and Destiny'. There will be seven lectures, all by experts in their respective fields, and a Conference Sermon preached by the Lord Bishop of Sheffield. The programme provides for an examination of the problem from the standpoint of philosophy, psychology, ethics, comparative religion and man's need and search for spiritual regeneration, and it includes also a lecture on 'The Implications of Psychical Research', by Professor H. H. Price of Oxford. This, we can be sure, will prove to be a valuable contribution towards the vitally important undertaking of synthesizing man's religious experience with the discoveries that are to-day being made by scientists in the paranormal field.